S. HRG. 105–409

ASIAN AND AFRICAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

THE CONSIDERATION OF S. 1287, THE ASIAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION ACT, AND S. 627, THE AFRICAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION ACT

NOVEMBER 4, 1997

Printed for the use of the Committee on Environment and Public Works

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

47–220 CC WASHINGTON : 1998

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

JOHN H. CHAFEE, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
ROBERT SMITH, New Hampshire
DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Idaho
JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, Missouri
TIM HUTCHINSON, Arkansas
WAYNE ALLARD, Colorado
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama

MAX BAUCUS, Montana
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, New York
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, New Jersey
HARRY REID, Nevada
BOB GRAHAM, Florida
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut
BARBARA BOXER, California
RON WYDEN, Oregon

JIMMIE POWELL, *Staff Director*
J. THOMAS SLITER, *Minority Staff Director*

(II)

C O N T E N T S

Page

NOVEMBER 4, 1997

OPENING STATEMENTS

Chafee, Hon. John H., U.S. Senator from the State of Rhode Island 1
Graham, Hon. Bob, U.S. Senator from the State of Florida 6
Kempthorne, Hon. Dirk, U.S. Senator from the State of Idaho 3
Reid, Hon. Harry, U.S. Senator from the State of Nevada 2
Smith, Hon. Robert, U.S. Senator from the State of New Hampshire 5

WITNESSES

Grandy, John W., senior vice president, The Humane Society of the United States 17
Prepared statement 53
Hemley, Ginette, director, International Wildlife Policy, World Wildlife Fund . 14
Letter, additional views submitted for the record 51
Prepared statement 43
Jeffords, Hon. James M., U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont 7
Prepared statement 37
Jones, Marshall P., Assistant Director for International Affairs, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior 13
Prepared statement 38
Marks, Stuart A., director, Research and Community Development, Safari Club International, Herndon, VA 18
Prepared statement 59
Report, Sport Hunting of Elephants: Asset for Wildlife Conservation, CAMPFIRE 61
Saxton, Hon. Jim, U.S. Representative from the State of New Jersey 8
Prepared statement 37

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

S. 627, A bill to reauthorize the African Elephant Conservation Act 27
S. 1287, Asian Elephant Conservation Act 28
Letters:
Africa Resources Trust 66
Environmental Investigation Agency 69
Kenya Wildlife Service 52
World Wildlife Fund 51
Reports:
CAMPFIRE—The Basics, Africa Resources Trust 68
Sport Hunting of Elephants: Asset for Wildlife Conservation, CAMPFIRE 61
Statements:
African Resources Trust 66
American Zoo and Aquarium Association 70

ASIAN AND AFRICAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1997

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2 p.m. in room 406, Senate Dirksen Building, Hon. John H. Chafee (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Chafee, Kempthorne, Smith, and Reid.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN H. CHAFEE, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Senator CHAFEE. Good afternoon.

The committee is holding this hearing to solicit views on two bills relating to conservation of the two species of elephants in the world today. The first bill is S. 1287, which deals with the Asian Elephant Conservation Act, and the second is S. 627, a bill to reauthorize the African Elephant Conservation Act. You'll note that the African is a reauthorization, the Asian elephant is a first-time bill.

Both of these bills promote worthy goals and programs in conserving these magnificent animals. Both have companion measures that have passed the House of Representatives and have been referred to this committee.

Before taking action on these bills, I feel it is important for the committee to have an opportunity to learn more about them. We have not had hearings on this before, to my knowledge, and so that's the purpose of this hearing—to acquaint our members with this legislation.

I have scheduled a business meeting on Thursday to consider, among other things, the Asian Elephant Conservation Act. The Asian Elephant Conservation Act, S. 1287, was introduced by Senator Jeffords on October 9. It's a companion bill to H.R. 1787, which was introduced by Congressman Saxton, who is with us today—and we are delighted to see you, Mr. Saxton. That bill passed the House on October 21 and was subsequently referred to this committee. The bill would create a dedicated fund authorized at $5 million annually for activities relating to Asian elephant conservation. The bill has received wide support, and if the Senate passes it before recess, it would be possible to include funding in the President's budget request as early as next year. That's the thrust behind our efforts to move quickly here.

S. 627 reauthorizes the African Elephant Conservation Act, which was enacted in 1989 and expires not in the end of this fiscal

year, but in the end of fiscal year 1998. The bill would reauthorize the Act through 2002 at the current level to $5 million. That's the authorization.

This bill was also introduced by Senator Jeffords as a companion bill to H.R. 39, which also passed the House and was referred to this committee.

I fully support the purposes of these two bills and recognize both the difficult plight of the Asian and the African elephants and the challenges facing efforts to protect them. At the same time, however, numerous species deserve the type of programs that these bills establish for elephants. That's one of the challenges we face.

There already exists a similar law for the tiger and for the rhinoceros, and conservation programs would certainly benefit the cheetah, for example, or the panda, to name a few.

Under this piecemeal approach, we could wind up with a new law for each species that needs protection. I think we owe it to ourselves, for the sake of efficient legislation, and I believe we owe it to the species, for the sake of effective conservation, to consider legislation that would establish a general fund for the conservation of all foreign species that could benefit from the type of matching grants programs currently established based on appropriate criteria. This is something I hope to explore in the future and invite the witnesses to address this question, if you could speak about this in your remarks. Are we going to have a plethora of this type of bill?

Today we are honored to have Senator Jeffords, the sponsor of both bills, with us, and also honored to have Congressman Saxton, as I said, chief sponsor of H.R. 1787, here to testify. I look forward to their testimony, as well as that of other distinguished panelists.

Senator Reid, do you have any comments?

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. HARRY REID, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Senator REID. Mr. Chairman, having participated in the reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act, I think that you and I would agree that criticism one receives for legislating greater protection for wildlife is plentiful. Criticism comes from all sides. I'm happy to see my friend from Idaho who worked with us and helped so much in leading the charge to get a reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act.

In that regard, of course, some say we aren't doing enough and others say the protections are too little, and then there's all kinds of problems about restricting property owners.

One of the bills we're considering today is a good example of why protecting threatened species can work. The African Elephant Conservation Act, now up for reauthorization, has helped contribute to the African elephant population stabilization.

My two colleagues, I appreciate their work on these issues.

By the late 1980's, the population of African elephants declined from approximately 1.3 million to less than 700,000. The primary reason——

Senator CHAFEE. I hope everybody listens to that. That's a shocking statistic. From the late 1970's to 1987, so that may be 10 years——

Senator REID. Not even 10 years, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CHAFEE.—the African population of elephants went from 1.3 million to 700,000.

Senator REID. Almost a 50 percent decline. The primary reason for this decline was the poaching and illegal slaughter of elephants for their tusks, fueled by the international ivory trade.

This Act, which has funded over 50 conservation projects throughout Africa, has been instrumental in stopping the demise of African elephants.

The other bill, Mr. Chairman, we're looking at today I want to make sure that the program in it relating to hunting of these animals is something that we approach with our eyes wide open. I'm interested in hearing more about this issue at today's hearing.

The Asian Elephant Conservation Act is much needed, and I want to do whatever I can to help it. As I've indicated, I want to take a look at this one problem area with this legislation.

I compliment you for holding this hearing, especially at a time when we have so much to do, but this is a very important issue.

I apologize to the chairman and the committee for not being able to spend all the time here today during this, but I do have staff here and I'm very interested in the issue.

Senator CHAFEE. Senator, could you just briefly say what was the problem that you had? I missed it.

Senator REID. Mr. Chairman, I have a problem with the African Elephant Act where a program—it's called "CAMPFIRE'—is set up so to provide money that supports the hunting of these animals. I've indicated that I want to make sure we're doing the right thing there, and I want to scrutinize that very closely.

Senator CHAFEE. I think the problem, more than the hunting of them, is the ivory problem. As I understand it, under CITES there is a ban on the trade of ivory, and under this so-called CAMPFIRE—and we can have witnesses to address this, and this is strictly the African elephant——

Senator REID. That's right.

Senator CHAFEE.—there, under a very controlled situation, the ivory can be sold and the funds used for conservation of the elephant.

Senator REID. That's true.

Senator CHAFEE. There's a back-and-forth on this. It was split down the middle with the different environmental groups on different sides, but the problem seems to be that if you do that, how do you tell what's legitimate ivory and what do you tell ivory that's poached. Are you then encouraging poaching?

Senator Kempthorne?

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. DIRK KEMPTHORNE, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Senator KEMPTHORNE. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

We have before us a straightforward reauthorization of the very successful African Elephant Conservation Act and a bill to try to emulate that success with the Asian elephant.

The interest of Americans in the international aspects of species management is not new. The Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969, one of the predecessors to the current Endangered Species

Act, called for the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, or CITES, which then resulted in the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, we're thoroughly engaged in the debate to reauthorize the ESA. Yet, throughout our debates on the ESA, we were unable to spend much time on the very real international issues that have been brought to our attention in the administration of CITES. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I'll continue to propose that we should have a different authorization schedule for CITES and international conservation issues under the ESA.

I believe that we must deal with the international issues brought to our attention without the overwhelming need to reauthorize ESA at the same time. We need to move forward with oversight hearings on CITES and international conservation next year, which brings us to two very important international conservation issues we are considering today: reauthorization of the African Elephant Act, and writing an Asian Elephant Act.

Until we can accomplish a comprehensive program of international conservation, we must continue to do this kind of species-by-species legislation. We now have nearly 10 years of experience with the African Elephant Conservation Act and the fund that it establishes. I believe that the African Elephant Act is an example and a model for conservation in other countries, and I believe it is worthy of emulation for the Asian elephant.

One additional word, if I may, Mr. Chairman, on the success of the African Elephant Act. Our involvement has been to provide technical assistance to foreign governments and to encourage local actions for wildlife protection. We provided a number of different management tools and techniques to encourage sustainable conservation. I will oppose any efforts to limit our technical assistance through the banning of any scientifically accepted management strategy.

Mr. Chairman, I commend you for holding this hearing. I know that we have an outstanding panel of witnesses today, including Senator Jeffords and Representative Saxton, who I have great respect for.

Like many in this situation, I have a competing hearing that I will be going to, as well, but I look forward to reviewing all of the information that will be passed on today.

Thank you.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. DIRK KEMPTHORNE, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Thank you Mr. Chairman for holding this hearing on Elephant Conservation. We have before us a very straightforward reauthorization of the very successful African Elephant Conservation Act, and a bill to try to emulate that success with the Asian Elephant.

These two foreign species will benefit from the conservation aspects of legislation that we pass here in the United States. The interest of Americans in the international aspects of species management is not new.

The Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969, one of the predecessors to the current Endangered Species Act, authorized a list of species and subspecies of fish and wildlife "threatened with worldwide extinction."

In addition, in the Endangered Species Conservation Act, the Secretary was instructed to encourage foreign governments to provide protection to endangered wildlife; to take measures to prevent any fish or wildlife from becoming endangered; to

provide technical assistance to Deign governments; and to encourage treaties for wildlife protection.

The Endangered Species Conservation Act also resulted in the Con vention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) which then resulted in the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

We are currently engaged in a debate to reauthorize the Endangered Species Act. Senators Chafee, Baucus, Reid and I have put forward S. 1180, the Endangered Species Recovery Act to reform the 1973 Act in a meaningful way so that we will in fact recover species and bring them back to an abundance so that they no longer need the protection of the Federal Act.

Yet, throughout our debates on the ESA, we were unable to spend much time on the very real international issues that have been brought to our attention in the administration of CITES. During our 1995 hearing on the ESA, we heard from witnesses on the effect of our actions here in the United States on other nation's ability to determine their own sustainable future.

For that reason, I continue to propose that we should have a different authorization schedule for CITES and international conservation issues under the ESA. I believe that we must deal with the international issues brought to our attention without the overwhelming need to reauthorize ESA at the same time.

Beyond my goal of establishing a staggered reauthorization for CITES, I plan to move forward with oversight hearings on CITES and international conservation next year. For example, CITES, as its name implies, is clearly limited to matters of international trade. A comprehensive treaty on the conservation of internationally endangered species as contemplated by the Congress in 1969 does not yet exist.

Which brings us to the two very important international conservation issues we are considering today: reauthorization of the African Elephant Act and writing an Asian Elephant Act. Until we can accomplish a comprehensive program of international conservation, we must continue to do this kind of species-by-species legislation.

We now have nearly 10 years of experience with the African Elephant Conservation Act and the fund that it establishes. I believe that the African Elephant Act is an example and a model for conservation in other countries. And I believe it is worthy of emulation for the Asian Elephant.

One additional word, if I may Mr. Chairman, on the success of the African Elephant Act. One of the reasons it has been so successful is that it respects the needs of the people and the governments in the countries where the African Elephant exists in the wild.

Our involvement in the conservation of the African Elephant has been to provide technical assistance to foreign governments, and to encourage local actions for wildlife protection. Through the African Elephant Act, CITES and other international programs we have provided a number of different management tools and techniques to encourage sustainable conservation. I will vigorously oppose any efforts to limit our technical assistance through the banning of any scientifically accepted management strategy.

Thank you for holding this hearing, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you, Senator. I think you've got a point there that when we're involved with reauthorization of Endangered Species, which has taken so much of our time, if we could have the reauthorization of these other foreign species at a different year, then maybe we could spend more time on it. I think your point is a very good one. Frankly, we haven't spent much time on the effectiveness of CITES, for example. You, who have been such a key player in all these environmental actions, but particularly, obviously, the Endangered Species, it is well worthwhile for us to heed your recommendation.

Senator KEMPTHORNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CHAFEE. Senator Smith?

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT SMITH, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Senator SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to delay any longer here the two distinguished gentlemen who would like to testify here, other than just to say I appreciate your holding the

hearing, and also commend both the Congressman from New Jersey and the Senator from Vermont for taking the lead on introducing these measures. There is clearly a huge problem facing these magnificent creatures, especially with the habitat loss, and I hope that we can garner support, Mr. Chairman, for this legislation, and at this point I just look forward to the testimony of the witnesses.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you very much, Senator. Again, I want to express my thanks to you for all you've done in connection with the whole series of environmental efforts we've made.

I will place into the record a statement from Senator Graham.

[The prepared statement of Senator Graham follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. BOB GRAHAM, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. Chairman, I commend you for holding this hearing of the reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Fund and the creation of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act. We owe it to the children of the world to do everything in our power to save these extraordinary mammals.

I have been heartened to learn that the African Elephant Conservation Act is producing positive results. I am hopeful that the Asian Elephant Conservation Act will likewise support research, conservation, anti-poaching education, and protection of the animals. I feel strongly, however, that no funds allocated by these Acts are spent to promote efforts to resume the ivory trade or to encourage trophy hunting.

According to a 1996 nationwide poll, 84 percent of Americans support efforts to protect elephants, yet I have learned that some of the funds from the African Elephant Conservation Act have gone toward promotion of elephant trophy hunting. As we have heard in today's testimony, there is much debate about the success and appropriateness of uS taxpayer dollars being used to support such activities. I look forward to hearing more about this issue in the coming months.

Again, I am in full support of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act, as shown by my cosponsorship of Senator Jeffords important bill, and am very supportive of the reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act. I am hopeful that all interested parties can work together to find solutions for the elephants, the rural communities in which they live, and the people who depend on them for their livelihoods.

Senator CHAFEE.Senator Jeffords, do you want to proceed?

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS, U.S SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF VERMONT

Senator JEFFORDS. Certainly, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you for holding this hearing, and all the comments of the committee members I think have accentuated the reasons we're here, as what is going on in the world in so many areas which is causing so much havoc with these species which have come down through the ages and must be preserved.

Three years ago I traveled to Africa to witness firsthand the status of elephants in the wild. I learned that by the late 1980's the African elephant populations had dramatically declined, as you've already delineated. Fueled by the great demand for ivory, elephants were illegally poached and their tusks sold for high prices on the international market. To stem the illegal slaughter, the international community joined with the African countries to eliminate the ivory trade and protect elephants in their natural habitat.

To our credit, the U.S. Congress moved fast enacting the African Elephant Conservation Act in 1988. This legislation provides assistance to African nations in their efforts to stop the poaching and to implement effective conservation programs. The Act has funded many programs vital to the preservation of the African elephants.

In Africa, I saw dramatic success. The U.S.-funded programs focused on empowering the local residents to value and protect these great animals—and I want to emphasize that—which seems to me is the heart of the success. If the local people understand the value of those animals and desire and will protect them, then most of the problems become much less.

Poaching is fought fiercely by the people indigenous to the areas to preserve incomes derived from travelers and tourists coming to see the elephants. U.S. Fish and Wildlife agents in Africa explained to me the importance of proper management of the habitat and the value of U.S.-funded programs. With these efforts, elephant populations have stabilized and are in the increase in southern Africa. International ivory prices may remain low, and wildlife rangers are better equipped to stop illegal poaching activities.

Given all these efforts, the African elephant is still hunted and remains at great risk. To ensure that this magnificent animal continues to survive in the wild, we must maintain our efforts. Passing a reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act at this time will indicate to the international community that the United States is doing its part to assist African nations in protecting the elephant.

Based on the success of the African programs, I have introduced legislation to provide similar resources to protect the Asian elephant. Since the challenges of the Asian elephant are so great, resources to date have not been sufficient to cope with the continued loss of habitat and the consequent depletion of Asian elephant populations. This bill is structured to ensure that all funds appropriated by Congress are matched by the private sector to fully implement badly needed preservation programs.

The situation in Asia is dire. Elephant populations in the wild are barely sustainable. A joint commitment and effort of nations within the range of the Asian elephants, United States, and other countries, and private efforts is needed to ensure the long-term viability of these animals. The committee's action in passing this legislation will prove vital to maintaining the elephants in Asia.

Continued illegal poaching and sales of ivory greatly concerns me. Recent controversy over the lifting of the ivory ban and the funding for the USAID CAMPFIRE program should not, however, impede the passage of these important bills. Lifting of the ivory ban is, indeed, troublesome, and no U.S. funds should be used to work to expand the ivory trade.

The programs funded through the Department of Interior for elephant conservation have not, to my knowledge, been connected to the ivory trade issue.

I am a strong proponent of the protection and conservation of these magnificent animals. These elephants are some of the world's largest land animals. If we do not act now, future generations may not be able to experience these animals living in the wild but only behind bars.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd be happy to answer any questions and listen to my good friend from the House, Representative Saxton.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you, Senator Jeffords.

Can you remain? What I'd like to do now is hear from Representative Saxton, and then we'll get back and question both of you.

Representative Saxton, again, we welcome you here. So glad you came over from the House.

STATEMENT OF HON. JIM SAXTON,
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. It is good to be here, and I'd like to express my appreciation for the dispatch with which you scheduled this bill. Also, I'd like to say it's very nice to see my friend, Senator Harry Reid, again. Harry and I, before the republicans took control of the House, used to jog together in the morning. He always jogged faster than I did, but it's good to see him, anyway. Senator Smith, we miss you on the House side.

Senator REID. I've slowed down a lot since the Republicans took over, though.

[Laughter.]

Senator CHAFEE. I missed the reference there. You jogged before Republicans took over?

Mr. SAXTON. Yes. I got busy then.

Senator CHAFEE. Go to it.

Mr. SAXTON. Senator Smith, it's great to see you again. We miss you on the House side, and we appreciate the great job you're doing here.

Senator Kempthorne, I've been following your ESA efforts very closely. I want to congratulate you on the great progress you've made. Some on the House side think your bill is too green, others think it is not green enough, so you've probably got it about right.

Senator KEMPTHORNE. Thank you very much.

Mr. SAXTON. We appreciate that.

Senator KEMPTHORNE. I look forward to your support.

[Laughter.]

Mr. SAXTON. Well, we had a long discussion, led by Chairman Young of the House Resources Committee, the other day about your bill. I think we find a lot in common with it.

Senator KEMPTHORNE. Good. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to concentrate my remarks and my opening statement—which, incidentally, let me ask unanimous consent or however you all do it over here, to have it included in the record.

Senator CHAFEE. Definitely.

Mr. SAXTON. I won't do the whole thing, but I'd like to concentrate on the Asian Elephant Conservation Act, because the program is in such dire need. It seems to me that it would be a great advantage to be able to move this bill in some way through the Senate this year, and hopefully in a fashion that it won't have to come back to the House, because we are having a good time over there, shall we say, and not maybe accomplishing as much as we should.

Senator SMITH. That's one of the reasons why I don't miss you that much.

[Laughter.]

Mr. SAXTON. Anyway, if this bill can get passed through the Senate and sent on to the President, it would be a great step forward,

because then we can get it funded in the next fiscal year rather than to have to deal with it next year again in the House. But I am obviously pleased to be here, Mr. Chairman, because the road to extinction can be a one-way street, and we must work to ensure that that journey is not taken by the Asian elephants on our watch, and I think that is extremely important.

I introduced the House version of this legislation with a number of my colleagues on June 4 of this year, and it is modeled after—as my friend, Jim Jeffords, pointed out—the African Elephant Conservation Act, which has funded over 50 conservation projects in 17 range states throughout Africa.

Based on the evidence, it is clear that these projects, worth more than $15 million in Federal and private matching funds, have been instrumental in stopping the demise of African elephants. In my judgment, it is very timely that we very soon provide a similar lifeline for relief of Asian elephants. In fact, the population of Asian elephants is far more imperiled than their African cousins. There are now only about 40,000 Asian elephants remaining in the wild in 13 countries in south and southeast Asia. While there are many reasons for this decline, including habitat loss, poaching, use in Burma's timber industry, and conflicts between elephants and man, unless some immediate action is taken, this species will largely disappear from most of the habitat outside India.

Under the terms of this legislation, Congress would create an Asian elephant conservation fund that would be authorized to receive up to $5 million per year to finance various conservation projects in each of the next 5 years. The Secretary of Interior would carefully evaluate applications in terms of the merits for each proposed conservation project, select those that would best enhance the future of the Asian elephant, and give priority to those projects whose sponsors demonstrate the ability to match some portion of the Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, we must not allow the Asian elephant, which has such a direct impact on so many other species, such as the clouded leopard, the rhinoceroses and tigers, to become extinct.

The goal of H.R. 1787 is to stop the decline and hopefully rebuild the population stocks.

I'll leave the rest of my statement for the record.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you very much, Representative Saxton.

I have a couple of questions here.

Senator Jeffords, your Asian elephant bill is slightly different from the House-passed version. Specifically, the House bill includes an amendment offered by Congressman Farr which prohibits the funding of projects that entail captive propagation unless for release in the wild. Do you have any views on that amendment?

Senator JEFFORDS. I don't have any problems with the amendment, Mr. Chairman. I don't see any reason to be concerned about it as far as attaching it or doing whatever you want with it.

Senator CHAFEE. OK. How about you, Congressman Saxton?

Mr. SAXTON. No. Obviously, I have no problem with it. I chaired the subcommittee hearing where that amendment was adopted, and, as I recall, there was no opposition to the amendment whatsoever, and, in fact, some of the individuals who are associated with firms or organizations that do captive breeding, as my recollection

brings back, had no problem with the amendment, either. In other words, they're not seeking the funds. So I think it is a good amendment.

Senator CHAFEE. OK. Now, with respect to the African Elephant Act, as I pointed out, Senator Jeffords, the authorization for that doesn't expire until the end of next year. We have a number of priorities during these last few days. Frankly, there is probably going to be controversy on this CAMPFIRE proposal which you touched on. I know there is a strong body of individuals, Americans and others, who believe that letting them cull the herds under various restricted conditions, use the ivory, sell it, make a profit, and then help the conservation—so all of that could be controversial.

Is there any problem if we didn't take up the African one this year—that is, the authorization? It's there, so you don't have to worry about it until next year. Do you see any problems with that, whereas we presumably go ahead with the Asian elephant.

Senator JEFFORDS. I have no problem with that. I think it is important to pass the Asian Elephant Act, and I think, as you look to the long term—and I know you alluded to it in your comments—at some point we probably have to have a broad sort of semi-endangered species approach to all of these animals which are becoming endangered. I think the best thing this year would be to pass this one, and then maybe next year think in terms of whether they should be joined together.

Senator CHAFEE. Now, Mr. Saxton, there are some differences between the two laws. The Asian elephant law requires Fish and Wildlife to consult with AID in making grants, whereas the African one doesn't. Is this of any import, the difference? If so, should we amend the African one, if we deal with that, to reflect this Fish and Wildlife consultation with AID?

Mr. SAXTON. The consultation, which is part of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act, I believe is a good thing, and perhaps when we deal again with the African elephant bill in the ensuing year that may be an appropriate amendment for the African bill, as well.

Senator CHAFEE. In other words, you think that having Fish and Wildlife consult with AID is good?

Mr. SAXTON. I do.

Senator CHAFEE. Senator Jeffords, do you have any comment?

Senator JEFFORDS. I agree with the Congressman.

Senator CHAFEE. OK. Quickly, Mr. Saxton, what about a single bill? You've been a strong proponent for protection of these endangered species overseas and been involved with it. Do you think we ought to have one bill?

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I would hesitate to say that I would think that would be a good idea, basically for two reasons. The first reason is—and if we did it, I would want to be sure that we did it in a way that would not complicate the situation in this way. Presumably we have three bills now that would authorize $5 million a year each, so presumably if you fold them together it would be a $15 million pot of money.

This system seems to work quite well with regard to rhinos and tigers and with regard to African elephants with separate bills, and one reason for that is that the parties can take their time, do the

consultations that are necessary, examine the proposals for projects, in a—I don't want to call it a lax atmosphere, but without the need to compete for the dollars, because the dollars are set aside for those programs, and therefore they can take their time and give them due consideration.

If there were one fund and if there were competition between the managers of the various species or the programs for the various species and it changed the context in which decisions were made, I would have some trepidation with that.

Senator CHAFEE. I've got to move to Senator Smith now because we've got a vote and I want him to have an opportunity to question both of you before we end this, and then you can both be free to go.

Mr. SAXTON. If I may just add one final sentence?

Senator CHAFEE. Yes.

Mr. SAXTON. It is not all that difficult, but it is not easy, either, to get appropriated, at least on the House side, $5 million for these programs. It would be somewhat more difficult, I would think, to try to get an authorization for $15 million, so there are two problems there.

Senator CHAFEE. Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I don't really have a question, but maybe a comment that you can respond to.

It just seems to me, especially with the Asian elephant, but somewhat true with the African elephant, as well, in the long term, that the major issue here is habitat. I mean, when you look at the demands, the population demands and the economic demands on those two continents, it just seems to me if you look out into the future—what we're doing here is well intended, and I certainly support it, but will it ever be able to even in any way deal with that whole issue of habitat? I mean, obviously we're not buying any habitat here with this, and it just seems to me like it's a problem that's just so overwhelming it's almost impossible to deal with it. I'd jut be interested in either one of your responses, if you wish to respond to it.

Senator JEFFORDS. Well, you're correct in this regard. I think you have to look to the areas that the animals live in and you have to look to the people of those areas to want to have them survive.

Senator SMITH. Right.

Senator JEFFORDS. That means you have to have them willing to dedicate the habitat to provide—if you're going to keep them in the wild area, they have to provide that habitat and they have to be supportive by protecting against poachers. In the long run, those are the two vital things—the habitat plus the common agreement to prevent poaching.

Senator SMITH. Of course, no question about the poaching, but most of these areas though—a lot of these people are dealing with famine and so forth. It's just a major accomplishment to stay alive for a day with a disease and a famine, let alone worry about an elephant. I mean, I'm just trying to look at it from the perspective of what we're dealing with in those countries, especially in—well, in both continents, frankly. I mean, it's so a problem.

Senator JEFFORDS. That's true, but we have seen some success in South Africa with respect to the ability to be able to manage the

herds in a way that compliments the indigenous people, rather than being a burden on them.

Senator SMITH. Do they have a fenced game farm in—fenced-in reserve, don't they, in South Africa?

Senator JEFFORDS. Yes, they do, I believe. The broad area is delineated and fenced in, I believe.

Senator SMITH. That's kind of a—that's unique, isn't it? I mean, we don't have that, I don't think, in too many other places.

Senator JEFFORDS. No. I don't believe so, but it can be done, I guess is the point.

Senator SMITH. Thank you.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you, Senator. We're going to go to vote now.

Let me just say that I followed this, I guess mostly through the National Geographic, in Africa, and it has been attended by considerable success there. In Asia I share Senator Smith's deep concerns that much—everything is habitat, I think, and on this committee we've spent a lot of time on waterfowl and anadromous fish and you name it, and it always gets down to habitat. In that Asian area—in India I don't know—in Africa you know the Great Plains in Kenya or South Africa or wherever it might be, but I don't know where these elephants live. Where do they live? India? Are they deep in the jungle?

Senator JEFFORDS. Burma, I believe, and India, and Vietnam has some. I'm not sure what other places have significant populations.

Mr. SAXTON. Basically, Mr. Chairman, their habitat has been reduced to patches of jungle or woodland measured in acres, of course, and the encroachment and conflict with humans in the Asian case is the primary cause of the decline of the species. Elephants are obviously difficult to live with, and in the Asian case there is a great need for education. If some of the conservation projects can find an economic reason to make these animals valuable to the native peoples, that's what makes these programs successful.

In the case of the African elephant, both tourism and hunting have been useful in creating an economic incentive to keep the animals alive and it has worked. In the Asian case we're looking at education and conservation projects, and hopefully some tourism that will help to spur an economic incentive to keep the animals healthy.

Senator CHAFEE. OK. I'm astonished that there are still 35,000 to 45,000 in the wild in Asia.

Thank you both very much. There is a vote now. Thank you for coming over, Mr. Saxton.

What we'll do is have a quick recess. We'll be back. I'll be back. I certainly hope Senator Smith is able to come back, too. Then we'll to go our next witnesses.

Thank you.

[Recess.]

Senator CHAFEE. All right. Now we'll have the next panel: The Honorable Marshall P. Jones, assistant director for international affairs, U.S. Fish and Wildlife; Ms. Ginette Hemley, director, International Wildlife Policy, World Wildlife Fund; Dr. John Grandy, senior vice president, Humane Society of the United States; and

Dr. Stuart Marks, director, research and community development, Safari Club International here in Virginia.

So if you would take your seats, please, we welcome you all. All your statements will be included in the record. If everybody could each confine his or her remarks to 5 minutes, that would be very helpful. We'll start with Mr. Jones.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARSHALL P. JONES, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Senator.

Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure to be here today, and we appreciate very much your scheduling this hearing on the reauthorization of the African Elephant Act and the adoption of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act.

On behalf of the Administration, I would like to tell you that the Fish and Wildlife Service strongly supports the reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act and also fully supports the enactment of new legislation on the Asian elephant.

Let me first very briefly, Mr. Chairman, address the African Elephant Conservation Act reauthorization.

We think that the African Elephant Act has played a very important role in progress with African elephant conservation. You noted, Mr. Chairman, in your remarks at the beginning, this horrendous figure of the decline of African elephants in the 1980's. Since then, that terrific problem has, we believe, more or less stabilized. That doesn't mean the African elephants are permanently saved from extinction, but it does mean we made progress through ending the ivory trade, and also, we believe, through focused assistance programs like the African Elephant Conservation Act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would be presumptuous of me to say that the African Elephant Conservation Act single-handedly somehow saved the African elephant, but we do think——

Senator CHAFEE. There's only been $1 million appropriated each year under it, hasn't there?

Mr. JONES. That's correct. Some years it wasn't even the full million. But, Mr. Chairman, what the African Elephant Act has enabled us to do is focus our conservation efforts, and there is no other fund like this anywhere in the world that is dedicated solely to African elephant conservation.

By using a very streamlined procedure where it's possible and necessary and we can address emergencies, we've been able to work with a broad variety of groups. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to say that we have approved conservation projects and cooperative projects with every one of the organizations that are represented on this panel today, as an example.

But, Mr. Chairman, we think there is no cause for complacency. The recent decision by the parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, CITES, earlier this year to allow a limited reopening of the ivory trade is potentially a cause for concern, and we think that continued attention to anti-poaching and to elephant conservation is more necessary than ever in Africa, and we believe that the African Elephant Act can be a big part of that.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of the Asian Elephant Act, I would like to say that the Asian elephant is only one-tenth as numerous as the African elephant, approximately 50,000 animals, give or take, but its plight really hasn't been given the kind of recognition that we believe it deserves.

Mr. Chairman, you also pointed out that it's almost incredible to think that these giant animals still are surviving in India, in other Asian countries. There are 13 range countries all together. But in those countries, Mr. Chairman, there are only 10 or so populations of more than 1,000 animals. Most of these are small, fragmented areas surrounded by increasing human populations.

But, Mr. Chairman, we do not think that means that it is hopeless. Far from it. We've already seen, through projects that we have funded under the African Elephant Act and also under the Rhino and Tiger Act, that there are innovative ways to help people live with these big and potentially very dangerous animals.

We have to work cooperatively with governments and also with private organizations, like the ones that are represented on this panel, and also local private organizations to find innovative ways of helping people deal with these animals, giving people incentives to live with them, giving people new ways, cost-effective ways of protecting their crops and their villages. We think, Mr. Chairman, that the Asian Elephant Act is a bill whose time has come. This is exactly the right time.

It's not too late. We still can make a difference to Asian elephant conservation.

Mr. Chairman, with your help, we would like to join with you. If this Act is, indeed, passed, enacted into law, we will do our best to implement it in a fair way, in a way that keeps our vision squarely on the objective of conserving Asian elephants in the wild. We applaud all of those organizations that have joined together in support of it.

Mr. Chairman, with that I have submitted a longer statement for the record and will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you. It's a very interesting statement you've got there. I had a chance to skim it. I want to read it more thoroughly. I'll obviously have some questions for you.

Ms. Hemley, director, international wildlife policy, the World Wildlife Fund.

I hope you would address, each of you, if you get a chance, the so-called "CAMPFIRE proposal."

STATEMENT OF GINETTE HEMLEY, DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE POLICY, WORLD WILDLIFE FUND

Ms. HEMLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.

Let me first just briefly share with you our views on the effectiveness of the African Elephant Conservation Act and on the great need for a similar act to address the conservation challenges facing the even more-imperiled Asian elephant.

I think several things stand out in making the African elephant fund, which is sponsored by the Act, a unique and effective conservation program.

First, it's a terrific example, in World Wildlife Fund's view, of how to get big bang for your buck—small bucks, as it is. The efficiency with which the program is administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service in many ways makes it a model Federal grants program, as small as it is. The $6 million appropriated through 55 grants have supported a wide variety of projects in 18 African countries.

As importantly, this fund has been the only continuous source of new international money for African elephant conservation efforts over the last decade when funding from other sources has proven erratic. While support for elephants flowed in the immediate aftermath of the CITES ivory trade moratorium in 1989, when the world was sensitized to the elephant's dilemma, funding from various foreign governments and NGO sources subsequently dried up.

A 1995 review that we were part of, as well as Fish and Wildlife participated in, revealed that many African wildlife departments have suffered severe budget declines, sometimes on the order of 90 percent or more over four or 5 years, as was the case with Tanzania in the early 1990's.

The serious trend makes the moneys authorized by the elephant Act even more valuable and needed today.

The African elephant fund is effective because it emphasizes small grants, it allows money to move with minimal bureaucracy, as Mr. Jones has pointed out. It also supports, in our view, a very balanced set of projects that no single special interest predominates, and projects are carried out in full cooperation with host governments.

Perhaps most importantly, the fund has achieved well over a two-to-one match in support from other funding sources, greatly broadening its conservation impact, and I think that is a very good model that we would see emulated in the Asian Elephant Act, and I'm confident that we would be able to see matching sources of funding to help the Asian elephant.

Just a comment on the trend of elephants in Africa over the last 10 years. As Mr. Jones has pointed out, we would agree that elephants are far better off today than they were 10 years ago, and that support from the elephant fund has made an important contribution to that success. Even though the recent CITES decision to allow limited ivory trade to resume in 1999, if certain conditions are met, has raised concerns about the potential for large-scale poaching to resume, the fact is that poaching levels today remain significantly reduced in areas where such problems were once rampant.

The situation, of course, requires close monitoring, and such monitoring is now being aided by the elephant fund.

I think the imperative now is for the United States and other governments and NGO's to help strengthen elephant conservation capacity in both Africa and Asia to ensure that poaching is kept under control, building on the successful programs achieved so far, be they anti-poaching, training initiatives, or community-based conservation efforts.

In short there has never really been a greater need for the African Elephant Act and its parallel legislation, the Asian Elephant Conservation Act.

I'd like to just put a strong word in here, as well, to advocate increasing amounts appropriate to the African elephant fund; $1 million a year is really a very modest amount of money, and I think easily $2 million could be spent on meritorious projects in Africa.

Senator CHAFEE. I missed one part. I couldn't follow you where you were talking about the poaching. I couldn't understand whether the poaching is under control or—were you following your script? What page?

Ms. HEMLEY. Basically, I was looking at the trends over the last 10 years and the successes that have been achieved in African elephant conservation. Poaching is much reduced from what it was 10 years ago in the midst of the crisis. Part of that success is attributed to, I think, support from the elephant fund and other sources.

Poaching has never been stopped all together. Clearly, there are problems, and we have serious concerns about those.

Senator CHAFEE. Is that for food, or is that for the ivory? Is it always for the ivory, or sometimes for the meat?

Ms. HEMLEY. It's for both. It's for both. I mean, I think the issue is that you've got countries in crisis in Africa that are affecting all wildlife, including elephants, and the important thing that I think we've learned certainly in our work is that monitoring is key. There are successful programs that should be seen as prototypes to help keep poaching under control, and we are certainly keeping our ears to the ground and watching very closely.

On the Asian elephant, as others have commented, we have a species that is in much worse shape overall than the African elephant. We, at World Wildlife Fund, are developing at the moment a priority-setting framework for conservation that is drawing upon expertise from around the region in an effort to increase our own commitment to protecting the species. We're facing in Asia many of the same challenges as in Africa: maintaining viable contiguous habitats, which is extremely tough in the most densely populated region of the world; minimizing elephant/human conflicts; controlling poaching, as well; and promoting scientific understanding of the survival needs of the species.

World Wildlife Fund would suggest that conservation efforts in Asia could be made most effective by focusing on elephant populations in habitat areas where the species stands the best chance of long-term survival.

There are about ten populations of Asian elephant which number over about 1,000 individuals, which is a size that is needed to ensure long-term viability. We would suggest that these populations be considered as priorities for support. About half of them are in India, others in Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Burma, and Thailand. A strategy that would emphasize conserving these areas would probably offer the best opportunities for securing the future of the Asian elephant.

Just to sum up and address a couple of the points you raised earlier, Mr. Chairman, on the issue of whether or not we should have one big fund for these species, rather than going for a piece-meal approach, we would share Congressman Saxton's concerns about combining everything together so that these different programs end up competing. When you've got such small amounts of money, I

think we need to be very careful that we don't lose any ground in support for those individual species.

Second, I think we've made enormous strides in increasing political and public awareness by using these funds as individually appropriated for species to really make people more aware about the problems we have with these endangered species.

If I may just take another half a minute to comment on CAMPFIRE, as you requested, CAMPFIRE we see as a very important attempt to really do the right thing in Africa. In terms of providing incentives for conservation, I think you have to look at the broader record of Zimbabwe in its conservation of elephants over the last 15 years. We've seen the population grow from about 45,000 animals to about 67,000 today, and so I think that, alone, is indication that there has been success there.

Now, certainly CAMPFIRE is not without its problems, and we have always supported close monitoring of how all these moneys are used, but I think we need to keep it in the context of the bigger picture of what has been good for elephants and other wildlife, as well as the people in those communities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you.

Dr. Grandy from the Humane Society. Doctor?

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. GRANDY, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRANDY. Thank you, sir. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for providing the Humane Society of the United States with an opportunity to testify on the African elephant reauthorization act and the Asian Elephant Conservation Act.

I am Dr. John Grandy, senior vice president for the HSUS, the Nation's largest animal protection organization, with more than five million members and constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to begin by thanking Senator Jeffords for his leadership over the years to enact legislation that protects the world's dwindling population of elephants, rhinos, tigers, and other wildlife. Both in the House of Representatives and now in the Senate, he has been a stalwart supporter of animal protection, and we commend him.

The Humane Society of the United States has a significant and lengthy track record with respect to supporting conservation in Africa. In 1993, we began by supporting the program of North Luangwa conservation project with Mark and Delia Owens, and have since arranged for annual contributions for their project of $30,000 a year or more.

This year, in January 1997, the Humane Society of the United States signed an agreement for a 5-year project for $1 million to be given to the National Parks Board of South Africa to support immuno-contraception, to support land acquisition, and to support elephant management in South Africa's fine national park system.

In short, sir, we support both reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act and enactment of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act.

We are concerned, as others have said, as Marshall Jones said for the Fish and Wildlife Service, of the prospects for a reopening

of the ivory trade. As you know, in June 1997, over the objections of the United States and more than 20 members of the Senate, the parties to CITES decided to reopen international trade in elephants and their parts and products from three southern African nations. We are concerned that poaching seems to be, while we can't say increasing directly, it certainly seems to be widespread.

I've noted in my testimony, sir, a number of incidents of recent origin that concern poaching. In Zimbabwe, for example, six elephants were poached in July, as compared to an average of four per month in the 6-months prior to COP–10. In Ghana recently two elephants were poached in Moli National Park. There had been no poaching in that park since 1988. In Kenya as many as 40 elephants have been killed. The list goes on and on.

While we can't say that poaching is increasing at this time, because there simply isn't that kind of comparative data, we certainly can be concerned at what seems to be going on there.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the Humane Society wonders aloud how many more African and Asian elephants will be lost before it becomes clear that the down-listing of the three populations of African elephants under CITES was a mistake.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in indicating our strong support for both African and Asian elephant conservation acts, we wish to note with concern CAMPFIRE expenditures and expenditures which have promoted ivory trading internationally. I say that because I wish to decline in a direct way your offer to comment on the CAMPFIRE program, but rather to comment on what the Humane Society of the United States believes are the significant and overriding issues.

In our view, it is that U.S. funds, taxpayer funds, should not be used to support reopening of the ivory trade or any resumption of it, and certainly should not be used to support trophy hunting.

We note with alarm that Safari Club International has received numerous grants totaling over $200,000, which have been used to directly promote trophy hunting of African elephants. We think that is distressing. We have noted the results of a quite dramatic poll that was produced by Penn & Schoen for the Humane Society of the United States, noting that 84 percent of the American public opposes trophy hunting of African elephants and opposes the use of taxpayer funds for that purpose.

Thank you, sir.

Senator CHAFEE. Thank you very much.

Dr. Marks from the Safari Club, International.

Doctor, why don't you proceed, please?

STATEMENT OF STUART A. MARKS, DIRECTOR, RESEARCH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, SAFARI CLUB INTERNATIONAL, HERNDON, VIRGINIA

Mr. MARKS. Mr. Chairman, Safari Club International appreciates the opportunity to testify here today. I am director of research and community development for Safari Club International.

I grew up in rural Central Africa, where my parents were medical missionaries, and I spent some 30 years researching community uses of wildlife and assessing wildlife programs. I am the project administrator for a successfully completed African Elephant Con-

servation Act grant called "support the CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe" on behalf of SCI. I'll talk about that a little bit later.

Safari Club International strongly supports S. 627, the reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act. In addition, it also supports S. 1287, the Asian Elephant Conservation Act.

We would also like to thank Senator Jeffords for his leadership on these significant issues, as well as you, Mr. Chairman, who seems to be up there alone, for your leadership in holding these hearings.

Our testimony today will focus specifically on the African Elephant Conservation Act. Currently, SCI administers two ongoing African Elephant Conservation Act grants in Tanzania. In addition, SCI has just successfully completed another grant in Zimbabwe. I begin with the Zimbabwe project. It allows us to specify concrete outcomes and goals supported under this grant program, and to clarify SCI's objectives for participating in these significant conservation programs.

The Zimbabwe grant was for $85,000 in support of CAMPFIRE. CAMPFIRE, as you well know, stands for Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources. The objectives and goals of this program were determined by residents within Zimbabwe, not by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service nor SCI.

The total project exceeded $150,000 in cost and was collaboratively administered by SCI, in conjunction with Zimbabwe's Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management, the CAMPFIRE Association, itself, Worldwide Fund for Nature, and the Zimbabwe Trust. The project was initiated by conservation concerned citizens within the host country who, in terms of skill, resources, and time contributed far more to the project than the above monetary figures indicate.

So my first point is this, Senator: these grants facilitate comparative efforts among a range of host country organizations, which participate together to conserve and protect elephants and their habitats.

My second point is that harvesting of small quotas of wildlife can restore and maintain an appropriate balance in biodiversity. Thus, CAMPFIRE programs demonstrate that local management of wildlife resources, coupled with property rights and economic incentives, do serve the interests of both human development and biodiversity conservation.

CAMPFIRE programs provide economic incentives to tolerate and sustain wildlife—in this case, particularly elephants. But also the program helps to ease the stigma of earlier colonial institutions while promoting new paths to rural development. I think that's critically important.

The Zimbabwe grant provided the means by which local communities can make their own assessments in evaluations of wild resources. Their communities have been empowered to sustain these processes. The ultimate aim of CAMPFIRE is for wildlife, including elephants, to be managed at the community level for the benefit of those communities.

Given the colonial centralized past history of wildlife management, this decentralization is a lofty and progressive goal. To succeed, several key elements are essential, including ways to assess

the size of the resources, the setting and monitoring of appropriate quotas, as well as other activities such as wildlife protection, habitat management, and ultimately marketing of products to pay for local opportunity costs for conservation.

The outputs from this project are already impressive. We have the written, field-tested, and produced quota-setting and teaching exercise manuals that are readily understood by villagers. That, itself, is significant. In addition, this project has held 13 workshops in 10 districts attended by some 363 participants. Returning to their respective villages, these participants will train local managers to assess, set quotas, and protect wildlife habitats and populations.

Senator, SCI is an organization of conservationists who hunt. Just as sportsmen continue to pay for conservation in our own country, SCI's contributions make possible conservation and management of wildlife in many lands. In addition to the millions of dollars which our members contribute directly through the purchases of licenses around the globe, we spend millions of dollars nationally and internationally on conservation projects.

Unlike other African countries, sport-hunted elephant populations in Zimbabwe and Tanzania have increased in recent years.

Senator I would like to submit this paper written by SCI to demonstrate the contribution that sport hunting makes to elephant conservation, primarily in Zimbabwe, but also with reference to Tanzania.

Senator CHAFEE. That's fine.

Mr. MARKS. Assessing elephant populations and allowing quota offtakes from these populations allows for sustainable uses and support for conservation programs. That's what our two grants in Tanzania are about.

Dr. Grandy has already mentioned these. I'll mention them briefly. One is to train government game scouts in the use of modern technology so that they can pinpoint important elephant parameters. The second is to help establish a basic survey of elephant populations within Tanzania, itself. On each of these grants, host-country organizations are those who have contributed to the contributions that the grant program makes.

The African Elephant Conservation Act was enacted to conserve elephants. In cooperation with various conservation organizations and ministries, this program provides both means and incentives for African range nations to actively manage the natural resources, including elephants.

As demonstrated by these four grants administered through SCI, we feel that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is appropriately addressing conservation of elephants, as well as the concerns of rural people which co-exist with this, the largest land mammal.

Senator CHAFEE. All right. Thank you very much, Dr. Marks.

Ms. Hemley, you indicated in your testimony that the cuts in the local countries' wildlife protection budgets were severe. So are we in a situation here where we don't have what you might call maintenance of effort? In other words, the United States comes in—true, $1 million isn't a great deal and these grants are relatively small, but is it an encouragement for the local countries to say, "Well, let those rich Americans carry the ball"?

Ms. HEMLEY. It's obviously a pretty complex scene, and it's not a very encouraging one in many respects in much of Africa.

I think what the value of the elephant fund here in the United States has been is that it has allowed us to play a leadership role. We are hopeful that, especially in the aftermath of the CITES decision, that other governments will be willing to put in the necessary funds to help with the monitoring that is even becoming more critical for the elephant populations in both Africa and Asia.

It's not a unique problem for Africa generally, is it, I mean in the sense of support for these struggling governments and struggling economies.

I think, in countries in southern Africa that I am familiar with and East Africa, Tanzania, and Kenya, there are strong government commitments to doing the right thing and to doing what they can to support wildlife conservation, so we look at it as a way of forming and strengthening partnerships, basically.

Senator CHAFEE. Mr. Jones, under the Asian elephant program, suggested program, as I understand it, you would have to cooperate with AID, which apparently you don't do under the current situation with the African elephant. What do you think of that?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, actually we do that, although the African Elephant Act doesn't require it. When the Rhino and Tiger Act was enacted in 1994, which did require it, we decided that if we're going to consult with them on the rhino and tiger projects, we should also do that on the African elephant projects, and if the Asian Elephant Act is enacted, we'll do the same.

So we consult with them on the whole range of those things, and that gives us an additional perspective.

Senator CHAFEE. So you don't mind? It doesn't bother you?

Mr. JONES. No, sir. Not at all. Mr. Chairman, if I could also make a comment on the question that you asked of Ginette Hemley regarding the situation in range countries, a lot of those countries have had to restructure their public sector as a result of pressure from the international monetary fund or other lending agencies to cut down their expenses for their civil service, and that has certainly had an impact on natural resource conservation, but it has been a broad impact across the board.

What we require in administering our programs is that there will always be a matching contribution from whoever is getting the grant. That matching contribution could be in cash or it could be in kind, but no one somehow gets a free ride.

If we provide funds, for example, that would pay for the gas that goes in the vehicles of the rangers doing the anti-poaching, the government is still paying the salaries, providing the equipment, providing arms and ammunition—which we never provide to them—so it's always a partnership. Some of these are desperately poor countries where it is difficult for them to have the hard currency to buy things from outside the country, and that's where we can come in and help them.

Each grant is tailored to a particular situation, but, Mr. Chairman, we think that what we are doing is encouraging them to continue to make the effort. We say, "We'll help you, but you've got to be willing to help yourself."

Senator CHAFEE. OK. Dr. Marks, I must say I sort of have a tilt in your direction here, but I am troubled by the statistics that we see shown in Dr. Grandy's statement, for example.

Now, if I read his statement correctly—and you can help me, Dr. Grandy—the tremendous decline that took place in the 1980's, and then CITES, and then the price paid for ivory.

It is a difficult thing. You ban poaching—I ask this of you, Dr. Grandy. You ban poaching, and therefore there's not so much ivory, therefore the price goes up, therefore it makes it more worthwhile to do a little poaching. What do you say to that?

Mr. GRANDY. Well, unfortunately——

Senator CHAFEE. Whereas you see these pictures of great clouds of ivory tusks being seized from some place and then set on fire. It would seem to me that it might be better to dump them all out on the market, drive down the price, so then poaching doesn't become worthwhile. Although on the other side it may be the price goes down, so therefore you've got to kill more elephants to bring home the same day's pay.

Mr. GRANDY. Of course, that is the economics of supply and demand, and you have correctly summarized it.

Senator CHAFEE. Well, I've given the problem. I haven't given the solution.

Mr. GRANDY. In some ways. Well, many of us have advocated the—Ginette Hemley, to my left, and others of us have advocated for some time, either privately or publicly, the notion, frankly, that all ivory stockpiles should be destroyed and that some form of recompense through the United Nations or other funding agencies should be actively pursued to help restore whatever monetary value that should have to the nations which have it.

The conundrum that you have proposed, however, and suggested is absolutely real, but the effect on African elephants of the ivory ban began in 1988 and 1989, has been absolutely real.

One of the things I wanted to point out is that quite a lot of the increase in elephant population that has occurred in Zimbabwe and other southern African nations can be attributed directly to the decrease in poaching that that ban brought forward.

So we understand the conundrum. We understand the economics. I think a long-term solution is necessary, but I think we need to understand how valuable the ban in ivory trade has been.

Senator CHAFEE. What do you say to that, Dr. Marks?

Mr. MARKS. To the ban of ivory trade?

Senator CHAFEE. Yes. What do you think? I mean, you folks are on the other side of this issue.

Mr. MARKS. That's right. I think that the countries who have asked for down-listing of ivory trade have done their homework, they have come up with a program of management, they know what they're doing, and Safari Club is willing to support them and trust them in terms of enhancing their own capabilities, not only for management of elephants but also for managing habitat.

Senator CHAFEE. Suppose I'm an ivory dealer in Shanghai and I'm a good fellow and I want to do the right thing, and so I buy some ivory that I'm assured has come from Zimbabwe, where they've culled the herd and they're doing everything in the correct

manner, but that has not come from Zimbabwe, it has come from a poached elephant in Kenya. How do I know the difference?

Mr. MARKS. Well, I haven't talked to a Chinese merchant in Hong Kong, Senator, but I have come down here to support a program in African elephant conservation, which is very good, and that's what I have tried to support. I don't know how you expect a merchant to tell the difference between this type of ivory or that type of ivory.

Senator CHAFEE. The reason I'm asking that question—you might say, "How did we get into all of this?" We get into it because in the reauthorization of the African elephant there is a school of thought that embraces the so-called CAMPFIRE approach, and so it behooves us to try to arrive at an answer.

Mr. MARKS. I think CAMPFIRE is trying to arrive at an answer, Senator. It is an experiment to try and deal with these new issues in terms of human development and habitat conservation and elephant conservation, is it not? I mean, it is an experiment very much in process.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, if I could interject where the Administration is on those two issues, because there are elements of what both Dr. Grandy and what Dr. Marks has said that we fully agree with and other elements that we don't agree with as much, but we think it's very important to make a distinction between elephant trophy hunting and commercial ivory trade. Whatever everyone thinks about trophy hunting, that's not an issue about poaching. That's an issue about whether one agrees or not with the idea of sport hunters paying a lot of money to shoot male elephants, usually with large tusks, which they then acquire for their personal use. They don't go into the commercial trade. It doesn't fuel poaching, doesn't fuel the commercial trade. It is an issue in its own right.

The second issue is either poaching or deliberate killing—that is, culling of elephants for the commercial trade. We support sustainably managed trophy hunting. We allow those trophies to come in from some but not all countries in Africa. They don't all meet the standard, but we think that can be a responsible way to manage elephants in some cases. It does give people an incentive.

Senator CHAFEE. Where would that be? In Zimbabwe?

Mr. JONES. Zimbabwe, Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Tanzania. We have denied import of elephant trophies from some other countries that don't meet the standard, previously Cameroon, and so far Ethiopia. If they can get to the point where they meet the standard, we would issue permits, but we don't right now.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is different than the issue of a commercial ivory trade, the decision made by CITES to reopen a commercial ivory trade, which we do not agree with, just for the reasons that you were posing to Dr. Marks. We don't think there are good international systems in place to be able to know that a commercial shipment of ivory for sure originated in one of the countries with good elephant management, like Zimbabwe, or, in fact, actually came from Kenya or was poached in some other country.

Once it gets into the marketplace, it is increasingly difficult to track the origin of the ivory, and you always can have legal trade that is a smoke screen for illegal trade. So we just don't think the

world is ready. The systems are not in place. A trade in ivory for commercial purposes was not warranted at this time, and we're going to do everything we can to help make sure, using the Elephant Act, to make sure that there is no increase in poaching or that, if there is an increase, we can detect it, we can know what is happening and have that information to present to other CITES countries.

Senator CHAFEE. I'll take a quick poll here—yes?

Mr. GRANDY. I just wanted to follow on that, Mr. Chairman, and say that I think Marshall has very directly explained those two issues and that our perspective is not whether or not we are against rural development for indigenous people, which is the broadest context in which CAMPFIRE exists, but rather whether United States Government funds should be used to promote either the ivory trade or trophy hunting, and in both of those issues we believe the answer is no.

Thank you.

Senator CHAFEE. How many people here think that we should combine these programs under one and you might say protection of foreign species under one Act, whether it include the rhino, the Asian elephant, the African elephant. How many say no? Raise your hands.

Mr. GRANDY. No.

Ms. HEMLEY. No.

Senator CHAFEE. Dr. Marks?

Mr. MARKS. Would you rephrase the question, because I'm inclined to say I don't know.

Senator CHAFEE. Well, you're not allowed to do that. You've got to vote.

[Laughter.]

Senator CHAFEE. Would you like to—there is a program now in which the United States has, in this committee, authorizes—there's a difference between authorization and appropriation. We authorize and another committee appropriates. We authorize X dollars for the protection of the African elephant, the proposal to authorize X dollars for the protection of rhinos and tigers. We have one now proposed for the protection of Asian elephants and X dollars for each of these. They are separate programs.

Somebody says, quite logically, "Look, you've got a program for everything, each of these species. Why don't you combine them with a bigger sum and do it that way."

The others voted no. How do you vote?

Mr. MARKS. I may be——

Senator CHAFEE. The poll is about to close.

[Laughter.]

Senator CHAFEE. Yes or no? Well, never mind. You don't have to vote. All right. Undecided. OK.

Let me just say this: it may not—I think Representative Saxton kind of hit on it, as I understood him. Frequently you can get more little bits, and each one with a constituency. There is a constituency for the Asian elephant, so they press for just a little sum, just $1 million a year, and along comes somebody else, constituency for the leopard, a little bit there; constituency for the African elephant, a little bit there; constituency for the rhino. So each one is able to

get, whereas if you combine them all and come in for the total of that sum, people say, "No, it's too much," so maybe little bites are better. Several small bites might get you more than one bite.

Mr. GRANDY. I believe, sir, we would certainly agree with that. In addition, I think a very big part of this is that the American public really supports doing something directly for the Asian elephant, and we would very much support that. Thank you.

Senator CHAFEE. What——

Mr. MARKS. Can I vote now, Senator, that I understand the issue?

Senator CHAFEE. I don't know. The poll is closed.

[Laughter.]

Senator CHAFEE. You go ahead and vote, but yes or no. Ronald Reagan used to have on the front of him a cube. It wasn't a cube. It was a block that had four sides to it and you spun it, and it would say yes, no, undecided, and maybe. What are you?

Mr. MARKS. I voted yes.

Senator CHAFEE. You vote against?

Mr. MARKS. No, yes.

Senator CHAFEE. So long ago I can't remember what the issue was.

[Laughter.]

Senator CHAFEE. You voted yes?

Mr. MARKS. Sure.

Senator CHAFEE. Well, I have to review what the issue was, now.

OK. Let me just say this. The subject before us this afternoon is both the Asian and the African. On the Asian, where we haven't had any experience, what do you suggest, Mr. Jones, or Ms. Hemley, we could spend this money on? It seems to me that the problem here is habitat. The amounts we're dealing with that would go out through your organization and would presumably be comparable to what we do in the African elephant are relatively modest amounts. I don't know what's the largest single grant you make in a year? Less than 100,000, isn't it? So you're not going to be able to buy much habitat with that.

Senator Smith evidenced deep concern that it just overwhelms us, the whole problem. What do you say?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, first of all, we would say that any country where we're operating has to have some commitment, themselves, to conservation, but we can give them an incentive to increase that commitment.

Our dollars—what seems like a small grant here, $20,000, to the Bombay Natural History Society, one of the organizations that we have worked with for many years on other kinds of projects, it's a fortune. They can put many people to work in conservation. They can produce educational materials. They can pay teachers to add a component on conservation into the curriculum and reach school children. There are huge things that they can do with what we consider to be very modest amounts of money.

We do have experience working with organizations, particularly in India, through a program that is not very heralded, Mr. Chairman, but has achieved terrific results. It's the U.S.-India fund. It's money which the Indian government owes the United States for grain. They pay it to us in Indian rupees. It has accumulated over

the years. It cannot be turned into dollars, and so the U.S. Embassy and the Department of the Treasury have made those funds available to government agencies to run programs, and we competed successfully to get some of that, and so we have a lot of experience working in India using these funds, directing these funds.

Senator CHAFEE. That's a good answer. What do you say, Ms. Hemley?

Ms. HEMLEY. We would say that we would suggest being a little more strategic, perhaps, in investments and habitat. We have enough knowledge and new tools available to us today—GIS and mapping techniques and such—that we do have, I think, a good sense of where Asian elephants would stand the best chance of long-term survival.

As I mentioned in my remarks, there are probably ten populations of a thousand individual elephants or more, which are probably the populations that will last for the longest over the longer term, and these might be considered the priorities for conservation. They're spread out among about six countries, half of which are in India. Half of the elephants in this group of ten are in India. That might be one way to approach it because, as you say, it is enormously challenging, the habitat needs are so great. So focusing on those areas which are the most promising might be one approach.

Senator CHAFEE. That's a good answer.

Thank you all very, very much for coming today, and we want to move on with this. Whether we'll do the African elephant renewal this year or next year, the Asian one—it's my understanding that if the Administration wants to get in some money for it we should authorize that quickly, so we'll try and do that.

Thank you all very much for coming. That concludes this hearing.

[Whereupon, at 3:47 p.m., the committee was adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

[The bills and additional statements submitted for the record follow:]

II

105TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 627

To reauthorize the African Elephant Conservation Act.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 22, 1997

Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. WELLSTONE) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works

---

A BILL

To reauthorize the African Elephant Conservation Act.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE AFRICAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION ACT.

Section 2306 of the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4245) is amended by striking "fiscal years" and all that follows through "1998" and inserting "fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.".

○

II

105TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1287

To assist in the conservation of Asian elephants by supporting and providing financial resources for the conservation programs of nations within the range of Asian elephants and projects of persons with demonstrated expertise in the conservation of Asian elephants.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER 9, 1997

Mr. JEFFORDS introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works

---

A BILL

To assist in the conservation of Asian elephants by supporting and providing financial resources for the conservation programs of nations within the range of Asian elephants and projects of persons with demonstrated expertise in the conservation of Asian elephants.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4 This Act may be cited as the "Asian Elephant Con-
5 servation Act of 1997".

6 **SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

7 The Congress finds the following:

(1) Asian elephant populations in nations within the range of Asian elephants have continued to decline to the point that the long-term survival of the species in the wild is in serious jeopardy.

(2) The Asian elephant is listed as an endangered species under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and under appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

(3) Because the challenges facing the conservation of Asian elephants are so great, resources to date have not been sufficient to cope with the continued loss of habitat and the consequent diminution of Asian elephant populations.

(4) The Asian elephant is a flagship species for the conservation of tropical forest habitats in which it is found and provides the consequent benefit from such conservation to numerous other species of wildlife including many other endangered species.

(5) Among the threats to the Asian elephant in addition to habitat loss are population fragmentation, human-elephant conflict, poaching for ivory, meat, hide, bones and teeth, and capture for domestication.

(6) To reduce, remove, or otherwise effectively address these threats to the long-term viability of populations of Asian elephants in the wild will require the joint commitment and effort of nations within the range of Asian elephants, the United States and other countries, and the private sector.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are the following:

(1) To perpetuate healthy populations of Asian elephants.

(2) To assist in the conservation and protection of Asian elephants by supporting the conservation programs of Asian elephant range states and the CITES Secretariat.

(3) To provide financial resources for those programs.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term "CITES" means the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, signed on March 3, 1973, and its appendices.

(2) The term "conservation" means the use of methods and procedures necessary to bring Asian elephants to the point at which there are sufficient

populations in the wild to ensure that the species does not become extinct, including all activities associated with scientific resource management, such as conservation, protection, restoration, acquisition, and management of habitat; research and monitoring of known populations; assistance in the development of management plans for managed elephant ranges; CITES enforcement; law enforcement through community participation; translocation of elephants; conflict resolution initiatives; and community outreach and education.

(3) The term "Fund" means the Asian Elephant Conservation Fund established under section 6(a).

(4) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

SEC. 5. ASIAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, subject to the availability of funds and in consultation with the Administrator, shall use amounts in the Fund to provide financial assistance for projects for the conservation of Asian ele-

1 phants for which final project proposals are approved by
2 the Secretary in accordance with this section.
3 (b) PROJECT PROPOSAL.—Any relevant wildlife man-
4 agement authority of a nation within the range of Asian
5 elephants whose activities directly or indirectly affect
6 Asian elephant populations, the CITES Secretariat, or
7 any person with demonstrated expertise in the conserva-
8 tion of Asian elephants, may submit to the Secretary a
9 project proposal under this section. Each proposal shall
10 include the following:
11 (1) The name of the individual responsible for
12 conducting the project.
13 (2) A succinct statement of the purposes of the
14 project.
15 (3) A description of the qualifications of the in-
16 dividuals who will conduct the project.
17 (4) An estimate of the funds and time required
18 to complete the project.
19 (5) Evidence of support of the project by appro-
20 priate governmental entities of countries in which
21 the project will be conducted, if the Secretary deter-
22 mines that the support is required for the success of
23 the project.

(6) Information regarding the source and amount of matching funding available to the applicant.

(7) Any other information the Secretary considers to be necessary for evaluating the eligibility of the project for funding under this Act.

(c) PROJECT REVIEW AND APPROVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Within 30 days after receiving a final project proposal, the Secretary shall provide a copy of the proposal to the Administrator. The Secretary shall review each final project proposal to determine if it meets the criteria set forth in subsection (d).

(2) CONSULTATION; APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL.—Not later than 6 months after receiving a final project proposal, and subject to the availability of funds, the Secretary, after consulting with the Administrator, shall—

(A) request written comments on the proposal from each country within which the project is to be conducted;

(B) after requesting those comments, approve or disapprove the proposal; and

(C) provide written notification of that approval or disapproval to the person who submit-

ted the proposal, the Administrator, and each of those countries.

(d) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL.—The Secretary may approve a final project proposal under this section if the project will enhance programs for conservation of Asian elephants by assisting efforts to—

(1) implement conservation programs;

(2) address the conflicts between humans and elephants that arise from competition for the same habitat;

(3) enhance compliance with provisions of CITES and laws of the United States or a foreign country that prohibit or regulate the taking or trade of Asian elephants or regulate the use and management of Asian elephant habitat;

(4) develop sound scientific information on the condition of Asian elephant habitat, Asian elephant population numbers and trends, or the threats to such habitat, numbers, or trends; or

(5) promote cooperative projects on those topics with other foreign governments, affected local communities, nongovernmental organizations, or others in the private sector.

(e) PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY.—To the maximum extent practical, in determining whether to approve project

1 proposals under this section, the Secretary shall give con-
2 sideration to projects which will enhance sustainable inte-
3 grated conservation development programs to ensure ef-
4 fective, long-term conservation of Asian elephants.

5 (f) PROJECT REPORTING.—Each person who receives
6 assistance under this section for a project shall provide
7 periodic reports, as the Secretary considers necessary, to
8 the Secretary and the Administrator. Each report shall in-
9 clude all information required by the Secretary, after con-
10 sulting with the Administrator, for evaluating the progress
11 and success of the project.

12 (g) MATCHING FUNDS.—In determining whether to
13 approve project proposals under this section, the Secretary
14 shall give priority to those projects for which there exists
15 some measure of matching funds.

16 **SEC. 6. ASIAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION FUND.**

17 (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the
18 general fund of the Treasury a separate account to be
19 known as the "Asian Elephant Conservation Fund", which
20 shall consist of amounts deposited into the Fund by the
21 Secretary of the Treasury under subsection (b).

22 (b) DEPOSITS INTO THE FUND.—The Secretary of
23 the Treasury shall deposit into the Fund—

24 (1) all amounts received by the Secretary in the
25 form of donations under subsection (d); and

(2) other amounts appropriated to the Fund.

(c) USE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary may use amounts in the Fund without further appropriation to provide assistance under section 5.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—Of amounts in the Fund available for each fiscal year, the Secretary may use not more than 3 percent to administer the Fund.

(d) ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF DONATIONS.—The Secretary may accept and use donations to provide assistance under section 5. Amounts received by the Secretary in the form of donations shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit into the Fund.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Fund $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 to carry out this Act, which may remain available until expended.

○

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES M. JEFFORDS, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF VERMONT

Thank you for holding this important hearing on the fate of elephants. I commend you, Mr. Chairman, and all the members of this committee for taking the time to address this important issue.

Three years ago I traveled to Africa to witness first hand the status of elephants in the wild. I learned that by the late 1980's, the African elephant populations had dramatically declined. Fueled by the great demand for ivory, elephants were illegally poached and their tusks sold for high prices on the international market.

To stem the illegal slaughter, the international community joined with African countries to eliminate the ivory trade and protect elephants in their natural habitat.

To our credit, the U.S. Congress moved fast, enacting the African Elephant Conservation Act in 1988. This legislation provides assistance to African nations in their efforts to stop poaching and implement effective conservation programs. The Act has funded many programs vital to the preservation of the African elephant.

In Africa, I saw dramatic success. The U.S. funded programs focussed on empowering the local residents to value and protect these great animals. Poaching is fought fiercely in order to preserve the income derived from travelers and tourists coming to see the elephant. U.S. Fish and Wildlife agents in Africa explained to me the importance of proper management of the habitat and value of the U.S. funded programs.

With these efforts, elephant populations have stabilized and are on the increase in southern Africa, international ivory prices remain low, and wildlife rangers are better equipped to stop illegal poaching activities.

Given all these efforts, the African elephant is still hunted and remains at great risk. To ensure that this magnificent animal continues to survive in the wild, we must maintain our efforts. Passing a reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act at this time will indicate to the international community that the United States is doing its part to assist African nations in protecting the elephant.

Based on the success of the African programs, I have introduced legislation to provide similar resources to protect the Asian elephant. Since the challenges of the Asian elephant are so great, resources to date have not been sufficient to cope with the continued loss of habitat and the consequent depletion of Asian elephant populations. The bill is structured to ensure that all funds appropriated by Congress are matched by the private sector to fully implement badly needed preservation programs.

The situation in Asia is dire. Elephant populations in the wild are barely sustainable. A joint commitment and effort of nations within the range of Asian elephants, the United States and other countries, and private efforts is needed to ensure the long-term viability of these animals. The committee's action in passing this legislation will prove vital to maintaining elephants in Asia.

Continued illegal poaching and sales of ivory greatly concerns me. Recent controversy over the lifting of the ivory ban and funding for USAID Campfire program should not, however, impede passage of these important bills. Lifting of the ivory ban is indeed troublesome and no U.S. funds should be used to work to expand the ivory trade. The programs funded through the Department of Interior for elephant conservation have not to my knowledge been connected to the ivory trade issue.

I am a strong proponent of the protection and conservation of these magnificent animals. These elephants are the some of world's largest land animals. if we do not act now, future generations may not be able to experience these animals living in the wild, but only behind bars.

STATEMENT BY HON. JIM SAXTON, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES CONSERVATION, WILDLIFE AND OCEANS, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to testify today in strong support of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act.

I introduced the House version of this legislation with a number of my colleagues on June 4 of this year. It is modeled after the highly successful African Elephant Conservation Act, which has funded over 50 conservation projects in 17 range states throughout Africa.

Mr. Chairman, based on the evidence, it is clear that these projects, worth more than $15 million in Federal and private matching funds, have been instrumental in stopping the demise of African elephants.

In my judgment, it is time we provided a similar lifeline of relief to Asian elephants. In fact, the population of Asian elephants is far more imperiled than their

African cousins. There are now only 40,000 Asian elephants living in the wild in 13 countries in South and Southeast Asia. While there are many reasons for this decline, including loss of habitat, poaching, use in Burma's timber industry, and conflicts between elephants and man, unless some immediate action is taken, this species will largely disappear from most of its habitat outside India.

This legislation was the subject of a comprehensive public hearing before my Subcommittee on July 31. While we heard from a number of diverse witnesses, the consensus view was that the bill would "send a strong message to the world that the people of the United States cared deeply about Asian elephants, and the U.S. Government is committed to helping preserve this keystone species."

After completing this hearing, H.R. 1787 was unanimously reported from the Resources Committee, and it passed the House of Representatives without objection on October 21.

Under the terms of this legislation, Congress would create an Asian Elephant Conservation Fund that would be authorized to receive up to $5 million per year to finance various conservation projects for each of the next 5 fiscal years.

The Secretary of the Interior would carefully evaluate the merits of each proposed conservation project, select those that best enhance the future of the Asian elephant, and give priority to those projects whose sponsors demonstrate the ability to match some portion of Federal funds. In addition, the bill stipulates that the Secretary may accept donations to assist Asian elephants and shall spend no more than three percent of the amount appropriated to administer the Fund.

Mr. Chairman, we must not allow the Asian elephant, which has such a direct impact on so many other species, like the clouded leopard, rhinoceros, and tiger, to become extinct. The goal of H.R. 1787 is to stop the decline and hopefully rebuild the population stocks of this irreplaceable species by financing, with a small amount of Federal money, a limited number of conservation projects.

While not an exact list, it is likely that these projects could include efforts to update population figures, assist in anti-poaching efforts, translocate highly endangered elephants, develop improved conservation management plans, and educate the public in range states about the value of this flagship species.

Although there are only a few days left in this session, it is essential that you move this legislation forward so that the President can sign it into law this year. It takes time for even the best conservation projects to be written and reviewed, and it is critical that Asian elephants be included within the Administration's fiscal year 1999 budget request.

This species can ill afford to be decimated for another year and, as someone who has spent his life committed to conservation, I am confident that you, Mr. Chairman, will provide the leadership necessary to accomplish our goal.

The road to extinction is a one-way street and we must work to ensure that the Asian elephant does not make that journey on our watch. I urge you to act favorably on H.R. 1787.

Finally, as a cosponsor of H.R. 39, I support the reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act. This law has been tremendously successful, and this Fund has been the only continuous source of new money for elephant conservation efforts. It is essential that this landmark Act be extended either now or early next year.

Mr. Chairman, again, I want to express my appreciation to you and the other members of this committee for the chance to testify on the Asian Elephant Conservation Act.

STATEMENT MARSHALL P. JONES, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the opportunity to provide the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's assessment of S. 627, the African Elephant Conservation Reauthorization Act of 1997, and S. 1287, the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997. On behalf of the Administration, the Service strongly supports the reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act through 2002 and fully supports the enactment of the legislation addressing the plight of the Asian elephant and congratulates the Congress on its foresight in recognizing this need.

First, I would like to address S. 627, the African Elephant Conservation Reauthorization Act, and how it has played a significant role in U.S. efforts to encourage and assist in on the ground projects aimed at conserving elephants in Africa. In fact, the early success of this program provided the impetus to the passage of the companion Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994, and initial funding provided pursuant to this new Act in fiscal years 1996–97 has allowed us to begin a modest

grant program directed at highest priority projects for critically endangered rhinoceros and tiger populations.

As a Party to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), and a major consumer of species covered by the Convention, the United States shares responsibility for supporting and implementing measures to provide for the conservation of endangered and threatened species, both at home and abroad. The African Elephant Conservation Act is designed to encourage and assist efforts to conserve one of the world's most ecologically and sociologically important species of wildlife. The Act's key element is the provision of financial resources to help support elephant conservation programs in the wild in their countries of origin. The Act is part of the strong U.S. commitment to assisting the people of developing African nations in implementing their priorities for wildlife conservation. Continued support by the United States through reauthorization of the Act remains critical to the continued conservation of African elephants.

I would now like to address the successes of the African Elephant Conservation Act. Enacted in 1989 and initially funded in fiscal year 1990, the Act has now given us over 6 years of experience with African elephant conservation programs in 17 African countries. The African Elephant Conservation Act came into existence at a time when most African elephant populations were declining at an alarming rate, due primarily to poaching for a large illegal trade in ivory. Population estimates vary widely for the African elephant from the 35 countries within the current range, but it is estimated that total elephant numbers declined continent-wide by as much as 50 percent during the late 1970's and 1980's.

In response to this precipitous decline, the Act authorized a unique, two-pronged conservation strategy. First, it required a review of elephant conservation programs and established a process for implementation of strict ivory import controls; and second, it established a Fund for cooperative conservation projects in African countries. Under the authority of the ivory trade provisions of the Act, in June 1989, the President established a moratorium on all ivory imports into the United States, which was at that time the third largest consumer of ivory in the world. The Congressional leadership that facilitated passage of the Act, and ensuing U.S. ivory import moratorium, were essential precursors to the U.S. leadership in the subsequent decision by CITES parties in October 1989 to transfer of the African elephant from CITES Appendix II to CITES Appendix I and impose a global ban on international ivory trade. While it was recognized that several African countries, particularly in Southern Africa, had stable elephant populations and were able to maintain adequate internal conservation programs, there was no effective mechanism to control international trade in illegal ivory.

The information available to us today shows that the ivory ban was quickly followed by significant declines in the rate of elephant poaching, ivory prices and ivory trade, combined with stabilization of elephant populations in many countries that were previously experiencing declines. It is important to note that there was also a concurrent increase in donor funding to help support anti-poaching and other conservation efforts in range countries following the Appendix I listing—most notably from the United States, including the first appropriation of funds under the Act. It is also significant and gratifying to note that the United States, unlike some other donor countries, is continuing to fulfill its commitment to elephant conservation.

However, there is no room for complacency. The debate continues today over the impacts of the Appendix I listing on elephant utilization programs in some countries in Southern Africa. Furthermore, some have suggested that poaching may be on the rise again, due in part to declines in both donor funding and in wildlife management and anti-poaching budgets in many African countries.

The issues of elephant conservation and ivory trade are very complex and were a significant focus of the Tenth Meeting of the CITES Conference of the Parties, hosted by Zimbabwe in June 1997. The elephant populations in Botswana, Namibia, and Zimbabwe were down-listed from the treaty's highest level of protection, Appendix I, to Appendix II to allow for a number of trade options including a limited commercial trade in their legal stockpiles of ivory, live animals, and for Zimbabwe in carvings, hides, and leather as well. The African Elephant Conservation Act still remains a critical link to enable continued active U.S. involvement in African elephant conservation, through both its import control provisions and the grant program. Implementation of this program has played a directly positive role in the conservation of the African elephant, and an indirect role in the conservation of numerous species that benefit from the conservation of this keystone species.

To date, the Service has funded 55 different projects in 18 African countries affecting over 225,000 elephants. Each project is a cooperative effort with African CITES Management

Authorities, other foreign governments, nongovernmental organizations or the private sector. No in-country project is approved unless it has the full support of and has been identified by that country as a priority for conservation. Through this cooperative approach the actual on-the-ground resources directed at African elephant conservation is almost double the $5 million allocated to the program since 1990. Under the Act all but 3 percent of funds allocated to the grant program are used to fund projects. Additionally, no overhead charges are supported by grant funds. All such costs are borne by the cooperators as matching contributions to the project. Thus. 97 percent of all funds allocated by Congress to the Fund are obligated to specific projects.

In implementing this program the Service has also designed a streamlined process that allows for timely approval of projects, and that has the capacity to respond quickly to emergency situations. Since no implementing regulations were deemed necessary, there was no time lag in initial receipt of funds and actual implementation of the program. Furthermore, the grant program is designed to provide quick, short term support for holding actions and other conservation measures, in concert with existing or proposed long range activities, or until such long range activities are in place. In the early implementation of the Act, it became apparent that there was a definite need for such a responsive grant program, and it has become the hallmark of its success.

One of the earliest projects funded was a cooperative effort with the Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife, Central African Republic, and the World Wildlife Fund. A cooperative effort was underway to establish a reserve in the southeastern portion of that country. While funds for gazetting the reserve were anticipated, no funds were available for basic equipment and operations of anti-poaching patrols—hired from local communities—until a cooperative project was implemented under the Act. When the first patrols were put into place, the only signs of elephants in a local clearing within the park were the carcasses of several poached animals. Today over 2,000 individual elephants, young and old, have been identified to be using that clearing. From an observation platform, local school children can watch in awe as dozens of elephants gather together.

In Senegal, the western most population of elephants in Africa is now secure. Through an African Elephant conservation fund grant, an anti-poaching program has provided local community employment and protection for the remaining elephant population. For the first time in years, baby elephants are now seen in this small but genetically valuable population.

In the first years of the program the majority of funding requests and the highest priority projects for funding were proposals submitted by or in cooperation with African elephant range state governments for anti-poaching assistance. Similar to the projects described above, funds have been provided to augment anti-poaching and management support in Cameroon, Congo, Eritrea, Gabon, Mali, Senegal, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Equipment purchased with these funds has ranged from vehicles to radios to field gear.

One of the most innovative anti-poaching projects funded is a cooperative effort with the Southern African Wildlife Trust and several cooperating African government agencies. It consists of a meritorious service awards program for game scouts and rangers in Botswana, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. This program has provided a much needed morale boost for the individuals who are asked to risk their lives every day as they routinely confront heavily armed groups of commercial poachers.

More recently there has been a shift in focus from anti-poaching projects to other conservation activities that address management needs and increasing human/elephant conflicts, as expanding human populations reduce the amount of wild lands available. In Southern Africa a number of projects have been implemented to assist range state agencies with elephant management programs. A cooperative project with the Zimbabwe Department of National Parks and Wildlife, for example, focused on the development of translocation techniques for elephant family units. Over 1,000 individual elephants were successfully translocated to new range in Zimbabwe when drought threatened hundreds of individuals with starvation and destruction of available habitat. That technique is now being used in South Africa and other range states.

Other management projects include investigations into the effectiveness of various forms of deterrents used to discourage crop-raiding elephants in Cameroon and Zimbabwe; training wildlife officers in Ghana about elephant biology and ecology; and elephant population surveys in Cameroon, Chad, Central African Republic, Malawi, Namibia and Tanzania. Projects have also been funded to assist in the establishment of a continent-wide database on elephant populations and in the establishment of the first comprehensive library of elephant resource material.

These are but a few examples of the significant successes of the African Elephant Conservation Act program, demonstrating the wide array of projects and cooperators. I hope that these have served to illustrate its effectiveness and positive impacts on African elephant protection and management. However, while much has been accomplished, much remains to be done. The annual requests for support of high priority projects greatly exceeds the funds available, and we believe that reauthorization of the Act can make an important contribution to elephant conservation.

Next, with respect to S. 1287, introduced by Senator Jeffords, I would like to address the needs of the Asian elephant and the ability of the Service to handle implementation of the Act and to administer the Asian Elephant Conservation Fund. In addition, I would like to provide information on the capabilities and commitment of Asian countries to protect this species and their habitat, as well as what additional steps could be taken to support the implementation of the Act.

From the first appearance of a fairly small tapir-like mammal in what is now Egypt 45 million years ago, elephants evolved a number of species which at one time inhabited nearly every continent. By the end of the Pleistocene glaciation about 10,000 years ago, however, only two species survived—the Asian elephant (Elephas maximus) and the African elephant (Loxodonta africana). As the largest land animals and as the ultimate symbols of power, elephants have always been viewed by humans with a mixture of awe and fear, commanding respect by their great size but also being viewed as a dangerous and sometimes difficult neighbor.

However, elephants also have other, more intangible values. In Asian cultures in particular, people have embraced the Asian elephant as a treasured partner in life, deified and venerated it into their culture and religion, trained it for hunting and war, and bonded with it at the most basic level. Today, the Asian elephant is also a keystone species for the preservation of biological diversity, since habitats which support wild elephants also provide a home for a vast array of other species, large and small, and thus also is a magnet for ecotourism.

Nevertheless, despite these acknowledged values, the Asian elephant also suffers from a series of paradoxes. Because it is the elephant species usually seen in zoos and circuses, with more than 16,000 animals in captivity, it may be more familiar to the average American citizen. Yet its status is generally less well known by the media and the general public than that of its larger cousin in Africa. With all of the publicity about the decline of the African elephant, they are still more than ten times more numerous than the Asian species, which now numbers only 35,000 to 45,000 animals. The story of the dramatic decline of the African elephant, primarily from large-scale poaching is well known. The dramatic decline of Asian elephant numbers due to the ever-increasing population of the Asian continent is relatively undocumented.

The Asian elephant must share its habitat with some of the largest and poorest human populations in the world. The combination of pressures on the environment brought on by these conditions has resulted in the conversion of forest cover to agriculture and villages, fragmenting elephant habitat and populations. It is believed that today there are only about ten populations with over 1,000 elephants, with half of these located in India. The majority of remaining populations are small, with less than 100 elephants each and some with lone bulls.

The dynamics of human population growth have inevitably led to increasing conflicts between humans and elephants. This is not a new phenomenon, but as the competition for the same resources grow, people's tolerance for elephants has dropped. Asian peoples have captured elephants for almost 5,000 years for training for work-associated tasks, religious ceremonies, and war. Where people once revered the elephant and tolerated the occasional crop raiding and destruction, now they are striking back, unfortunately often with lethal results.

Unlike African elephants, Asian elephants have not traditionally been threatened by poaching for the ivory trade, perhaps because females are tuskless and only 60 percent of the males carry tusks. However, recent trends since 1994 indicate that poaching for ivory, as well as for meat, is on the upswing, especially in southern India. The proportion of sub-adult and adult tuskers in various populations over the last 20 years has dropped dramatically, in some areas by as much as 75 percent. In one outstanding example, investigations in 1994 revealed that out of 1000 elephants in Periyar Tiger Reserve, one of the strongholds for elephants in India, only five adult males were left. Even among these, only two were tuskers. This preferential decrease in the number of tuskers indicates increased poaching pressure for their ivory.

The implications of this marked sexual disparity have yet to be assessed. It is obvious that it will result in changes in population structures, not only among adults but among sub-adults and juveniles. A drastic reduction in fertility has already been seen which will affect the long term demographic structure of this population. Simi-

lar effects have been well documented in African elephants which have been subject to heavy poaching; and even if poaching is brought under control, it may take years for normal birth rates and juvenile survival to be restored.

In recognition of these threats, the Asian elephant has been accorded the highest levels of legal protection through national laws and international treaties. It is listed as "Endangered" under the U.S. Endangered Species Act and on the IUCN—World Conservation Union Red List, and on "Appendix I" of CITES. Most of the thirteen Asian elephant range countries, including India, reinforce these international listings with domestic laws of their own. CITES listing, which is designed to eliminate the world-wide trade in ivory, has been partially successful. However, some illegal ivory obtained from poaching continues to move from country to country. Many Asian countries have the strong desire to reduce the levels of poaching and stop all illegal trade, but they need assistance if they are to improve their ability to enforcement the CITES controls.

In addition, while national legislation has afforded the elephant with maximum protection on paper, local conditions often serve to make this safety net more illusory than real. Forests in many areas can be owned by local District Councils or private individuals and subject to uncontrolled slash and burn, shifting cultivation, leading to disappearance of prime elephant habitats. Erratic economic and political situations as well as lack of emphasis on wildlife-related crimes have made it difficult for some countries to effectively enforce laws and to efficiently manage their elephant populations and other natural resources.

For these reasons, the Asian elephant is in trouble—and it will take more than legal paperwork to ensure its survival. Asian elephants need active protection and management of their habitat, resolution of the deleterious conflicts with humans over land uses, better law enforcement activities to protect against poaching, reduction of captures from the wild, and better care and humane treatment of the remaining captive populations. They also need the restoration of the harmonious relationship that previously existed with humans through community education and awareness activities.

Given the already endangered status of the Asian elephant and the new and insidious threats now facing it from the factors described above, it is indeed timely that this committee is now considering S. 1287, the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997. This Act acknowledges the problems of forest habitat reduction and fragmentation, conflicts with humans, poaching and other serious issues affecting the Asian elephant. The Act addresses the need to encourage and assist initiatives of regional and national agencies and organizations whose activities directly or indirectly promote the conservation of Asian elephants and their habitat, and it provides for the establishment of an Asian Elephant Conservation Fund, authorized to receive donations and appropriated funds. While many range governments have demonstrated a commitment towards conservation, the lack of international support for their efforts has been a serious impediment.

Patterned after the African Elephant Conservation Act of 1988 and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994, the Asian Elephant Conservation Act would assign responsibility for implementation to the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development. The bill would authorize the Secretary to make grants designed to benefit Asian elephants in the world.

The Service would also mesh the administration of this new legislation with our existing responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act, using our experience gained during more than 20 years of participation in cooperative wildlife programs in Asia—including, among many other projects, a 10-year ecological study of the Asian elephant in India involving training, research, and management activities.

Additionally, the Service has facilitated CITES implementation workshops in six Asian countries, and has so far provided support for 15 projects under the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act in three countries, with many more proposals now under review. The Service has developed an excellent working relationship with most Asian elephant range countries and with the CITES Secretariat, as well as establishing an important network of worldwide experts, advisors and cooperators that can be drawn upon for support and expertise.

Implementation of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act by the Service would be based on the pattern established by the African Elephant and Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Acts. The Service would develop a grant program with a call for proposals that would be sent out to a mailing list of potential cooperators from regional and range country agencies and organizations, including CITES partners and the CITES Secretariat. The Act's criteria for proposal approval gives the Service clear guidance, and priority would be given to proposals which would directly support and enhance wild elephant populations and which include necessary matching funds.

All amounts made available through the Conservation Fund would be allocated as quickly and as efficiently as possible. We expect that Asian elephant range countries and international organizations would submit a variety of conservation proposals for support, including research, management, conflict resolution, community outreach and education, law enforcement, CITES implementation, captive breeding, genetic studies and traditional mahout and koonkie elephant training.

Given the success under the African Elephant Conservation Act and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act, we expect that the Asian Elephant Conservation Act would make a major contribution to conservation, filling a significant void in our current programs. It would send a strong message to the world that the people of the United States care deeply about Asian elephants and that the U.S. government is committed to helping preserve this keystone species of the remaining tropical and subtropical Asian forests.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, the principles embodied in these two bills are sound. They provide a catalyst for cooperative efforts among the governments of the world, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector to work together for a common goal—the conservation and continued healthy existence of populations of African and Asian elephants. Findings made by Congress in enacting the African Elephant Conservation Act regrettably still ring true today: "Many (African and Asian countries) do not have sufficient resources to properly manage, conserve, and protect their elephant populations." The United States must share the responsibility to provide for the conservation of this magnificent species. This is not a hand out, but a helping hand. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, we urge this committee to give favorable consideration to S. 627, a bill to reauthorize the African Elephant Conservation Act, and S. 1287, the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997.

STATEMENT OF GINETTE HEMLEY, DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE POLICY, WORLD WILDLIFE FUND

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am Ginette Hemley, Director of International Wildlife Policy at World Wildlife Fund. I want to thank the committee for this opportunity to testify on behalf of WWF and its 1.2 million members in the United States. WWF strongly supports passage of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 and reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act, and would like to express appreciation to Senator Jeffords, Congressman Saxton, and other Congressional sponsors for introducing this important legislation.

Few species capture the public's imagination as do elephants, both African and Asian, and few species present as many conservation challenges. In recent years, the plight of the African elephant has become a prominent issue, as worldwide attention focused on halting the poaching for ivory that reduced the species' numbers significantly in many parts of Africa in the 1970's and 1980's. The June 1997 biannual CITES conference featured extensive discussion of the African elephant, highlighting the many challenges African nations face in their efforts to secure long-term survival of the species. The meeting concluded with a controversial decision that may allow limited international ivory trade to resume in 18 months if certain conditions are met.

While the global conservation community will be following the CITES African elephant decision closely, attention is also turning to the Asian elephant, whose status in the wild is even more precarious than that of its African counterpart. The combined impact of habitat loss, poaching for ivory, meat, and hides, and increasing conflicts with people threatens the species' survival in the next century. In fact, with a total wild population of only 35,000 to 50,000, the Asian elephant now numbers less than one tenth of the African elephant. The erosion of its habitat over the past half century also has fragmented remaining wild populations to the point that fewer than ten populations comprising more than 1,000 individuals are left throughout the species range, jeopardizing the species' long-term viability.

The African and the Asian elephant, and the countries struggling to protect them, urgently need our help. Securing their survival requires stronger protection measures for remaining herds in the countries where the species live, including establishing corridors to link existing forest reserves and allow for natural migration, promoting programs to increase conservation incentives for the people living closest to elephants, stemming the illegal killing for ivory and other parts, and reducing human-elephant conflicts.

The African Elephant Conservation Act: A Model Program for International Conservation

While the ivory trade debate has been the focus of much international attention over the past decade, it is important to recognize that elephant conservation goes well beyond measures to control commerce in ivory. The issue we are discussing here, Mr. Chairman, is international funding for wildlife conservation. To this end, the African Elephant Conservation Act has played a crucial role. The Act established the African Elephant Conservation Fund and authorizes up to $5 million per year for elephant conservation projects. Although the fund has never been appropriated the full amount authorized, it has proven an important instrument for helping African nations in their efforts to rebuild elephant populations hit hardest by poaching as well as for addressing the growing array of elephant conservation and management needs throughout the continent.

To best understand the importance of monies provided from the AECA, one would have to consult with the governments, wildlife officials and experts of the 17 countries which have benefited from its support. WWF has conservation programs or projects in 16 African countries and oversees several projects which have been the direct recipients of African Elephant Conservation Fund support. Based upon WWF's own field reports and contact with experts across Africa, the fund has been an important source of support for projects that otherwise would have not been possible.

Mr. Chairman, the African Elephant Conservation Fund supports a very modest program $5.4 million has supported about 55 projects in 18 African countries since the Act was first passed in 1988. In WWF's view, the Fish and Wildlife Service has been both efficient and effective in managing the elephant grants program.

Through many years of developing and managing international conservation programs and projects, we at WWF have learned many important lessons. One is that successful conservation initiatives require commitment and continuity. The African Elephant Conservation Fund has in fact been the only continuous source of new funding for African elephant conservation efforts in the past decade. Unfortunately, funding from other sources has proven erratic. In the immediate aftermath of the 1989 ivory trade ban, when the world was sensitized to the elephant's dilemma, funding flowed form various bilateral bodies and NGOs to projects in Africa. Since then, however, funding has largely dried up. A 1995 review supported by WWF and the Fish and Wildlife Service, with support from the elephant fund, revealed that many African wildlife departments have suffered severe budget cuts, some on the order of 90 percent or more over 4 years, as was the case with Tanzania in the early 1990's. This not only underscores a serious trend, but also makes the monies authorized by the AECA even more valuable and needed.

From WWF's perspective, some of the strengths of African Elephant Conservation grants program include:

- *Emphasis on small grants.* By emphasizing small grants, the Fish and Wildlife Service is able to move monies relatively quickly with minimal bureaucracy, while also ensuring that a wide spectrum of projects is supported. The African elephant inhabits some 35 countries, and conservation needs and capacity vary widely. The FWS has chosen to provide maximum reasonable flexibility by keeping grants small, while maintaining a broad focus to ensure funding for meritorious projects throughout sub-Saharan Africa.
- *On-the-ground focus.* Virtually all monies coming from the fund go directly to the field where needs are greatest; just three percent goes for administration. Moreover, the Fish and Wildlife Service has been responsive to emerging needs, as witnessed in 1993 when an anthrax outbreak threatened Namibia's elephant population. Emergency assistance was provided from the African elephant fund, and helped head off a potential catastrophe.
- *Balanced set of projects.* In the beginning, the African elephant fund supported mostly anti-poaching projects, as these were the immediate priority. Since then, we are encouraged that, while grants are still targeted at clear and identifiable needs, the fund supports not only anti-poaching but many other activities, such as elephant population research and censuses, efforts to mitigate elephant/human conflicts, investigations of the ivory trade and cataloging ivory stockpiles, elephant translocations, and identifying new techniques for elephant management.
- *Cooperation with range states.* All FWS projects receive approval from the host-country government before proceeding. We have found that there is a very clear process and commitment to consultation and, where possible, collaboration with African governments.
- *Matching funds.* Since the elephant grants program was initiated in 1990, more than $8.6 million in matching contributions has been spent on the var-

ious projects supported—a match ratio greater than 3 :2. In addition, the fund has played a catalytic role in larger initiatives, such as in the Central African Republic's Dzangha-Sangha Reserve. In a major effort to protect important wildlife habitat and biodiversity by working with surrounding communities to link conservation with development needs, African elephant funds are used to support three teams of game scouts that patrol the reserve and combat poaching. In partnership with WWF and others, the U.S. government has been able to play a focused role in the conservation of this biologically important area that is important for forest elephants as well as for many other unique species.

- *U.S. leadership.* Last but not least, the AECA has allowed the United States to put its money where its mouth is and set an example for other countries to follow. I would like to emphasize the importance of the fact that FWS support has not been curtailed once the poaching crisis abated. It is only through such continuing support that the long-term survival of African elephants will be realized.

The list of specific initiatives supported by the African Elephant Conservation Act is impressive and I would encourage members to review it. (The list of WWF projects funded under this Act is attached to this statement.) These projects have provided critical seed money to new elephant conservation initiatives in Africa, provided supplemental funds for existing projects with needs that could not be met from other sources, and helped build conservation infrastructure within elephant range states. With projects receiving matching support from organizations such as WWF, Safari Club International, the Wildlife Conservation Society, and others, the African Elephant Conservation Fund has clearly multiplied its conservation benefits substantially.

WWF believes that the positive results of the projects supported by the African Elephant Conservation Fund are the most important signs of the strength of the Act. They have allowed the United States to play a lead role where it really counts—funding initiatives in range countries to help ensure the survival of this threatened species in the wild.

The African Elephant Conservation Act has clearly established a successful model program for international wildlife conservation. However, it is sometimes tempting to assume that once the immediate problem is addressed, the problem is solved. Securing the future of Africa's wildlife requires a long-term commitment. Therefore, the continuing Congressional support for this program will be critical to the long-term viability of many elephant conservation initiatives. WWF urges Congress to maintain the strong support it has shown to date.

Urgent Conservation Needs of the Asian Elephant

The Asian elephant, which has shared a special bond with people for centuries, now faces an uncertain future. Reduced to fewer than 50,000 in the wild, the species has suffered from habitat loss, capture of elephants for domestication, and poaching for ivory and meat. Dedicated conservation efforts, backed by adequate financial support, are needed to stem these threats and ensure the long-term conservation of the species.

Addressing the broad and complex needs associated with successful conservation of the Asian elephant requires the kind of financial and technical assistance from the international conservation community that the Asian Elephant Conservation Act would provide. Carefully targeted, the resources this legislation could offer would have an immediate positive impact. The conservation benefits would be far-reaching not only for Asia's elephants, but also for the many other species that share the Asian elephant's range and the human communities that have co-existed with this species for so long.

Perhaps no other wild animal has had such a close relationship with people. In Asia, the unique relationship between people and elephants runs deep and dates back as far as 4,000 years, when elephants were first captured and trained as draft animals and for use in religious ceremonies and warfare. Its cultural contributions are especially noteworthy. Ancient Hindu scriptures frequently refer to elephants, the elephant-headed god Ganesha is revered throughout India, and the white elephant has special religious significance for Buddhists throughout Asia.

In addition to remaining wild populations there also are approximately 16,000 domesticated elephants in Asia. For years, Asian elephants have been important economically, especially in forestry operations. Timber extraction using elephants has less impact on surrounding forests during selective logging than less precise mechanical methods that damage large areas, disrupting ecological processes such as nutrient cycling and forest regeneration, and leaving tracts of bare soil which wash into rivers. Today, only in Burma are wild elephants still captured and trained for use in logging operations. Elsewhere throughout their range, domestic elephants are

used for transportation, draft, and tourism, providing a reliable source of income to numerous local communities.

Beyond this unique relationship with human beings, the Asian elephant is a flagship for the conservation of the tropical forest habitats in which it is found. Elephants range over long distances and across a variety of habitats that are home to numerous other wildlife species. As they need very large areas to survive, effective conservation and management of elephants can deliver widespread benefits for other endangered species such as the tiger, rhinoceros, kouprey, clouded leopard, Asiatic wild dog, gaur, Malayan sun bear, Hoolock gibbon, and countless other wildlife sharing its home.

The Asian elephant plays a key role in shaping its environment. Elephants knock down trees while feeding, and these fallen trees then become accessible to smaller herbivores such as blackbuck and sambar that cannot reach the branches of upright trees. Asian elephants disperse the seeds of certain grasses, shrubs and trees, which they deposit in and fertilize with their dung. A multitude of bird species feed on these seeds, as well as the myriad insects that congregate in the droppings. Few species have such a profound effect on the habitat and species around them.

Living in the world's most densely populated region presents daunting challenges for the Asian elephant. Because elephant herds range over such large areas, protection is more difficult than for many other species. The myriad threats the Asian elephant faces today is reflected in the fact that the species is currently listed as endangered under the U.S. Endangered Species Act and the World Conservation Union's Red List of Mammals, and also under Appendix I of the CITES. A brief look at remaining numbers of wild Asian elephants in its current range illustrates why the level of concern among conservationists is so high.

Current Range of Wild Asian Elephants

Bhutan	60–150
Burma	5,000–6,000
Cambodia	1,000–2,000
China	250–350
India	20,000–24,000
Indonesia	2,500–4,500
Laos	1,000–3,000
Malaysia	800–1,000
Borneo	500–2,000
Nepal	50–85
Sri Lanka	2,500–3,000
Thailand	1,500–3,000
Vietnam	300–400

Sources: IUCN's SSC Asian Elephant Specialist Group and WWF offices in Bhutan, Nepal, Vietnam, and India.

The absence of reliable data on population trends, and the difficulty of counting elephants living in dense tropical forests, makes it difficult to precisely quantify the decline in Asian elephant numbers from historical levels. But destruction of habitat has no doubt led to a precipitous decline in elephant populations and a considerable loss of biodiversity throughout their range. The Asian elephant once ranged from modern Iraq and Syria to the Yellow River in China, yet today it is found only in fragmented populations scattered from India to Vietnam, with a tiny besieged population in the extreme southwest of China. Current threats to remaining populations can be summarized as follows:

Habitat loss and fragmentation. Asian elephants inhabit some of the most densely populated areas of the world, and loss of remaining habitat poses a grave threat. Pressures of human population growth are most severe in countries such as Vietnam and India where once extensive forest habitats have contracted dramatically. Encroachment by migrating human populations in countries such as Indonesia pose another threat, and in places like Peninsular Malaysia, large expanses of forest have been cleared for palm oil and rubber plantations and other agricultural activities. Throughout their range, elephants are competing directly with people for the same resources.

Due to the loss and degradation of their habitat, Asian elephant populations have become extremely fragmented. Today there are probably fewer than ten populations with more than 1,000 individuals in any one contiguous area: half of these are found

on the Indian subcontinent. The problem is more severe in southeast Asia; only four populations have more than 1,000 elephants, two of which are found in Burma. Small elephant populations isolated in patches of forest in countries such as Vietnam, Peninsular Malaysia, and Cambodia face sudden extirpation from disease outbreaks and natural disasters and risk gradual erosion of genetic health due to inbreeding.

Human-elephant conflicts. Conflict between elephants and people is not a new phenomenon; elephants have been raiding crops since time immemorial. However, the reverence people had for elephants in Asia historically ensured its peaceful coexistence and made them tolerant of the occasional intrusion. In recent times, human settlements have been pushing further and further into elephant habitat, and the incidence of crop-raiding has increased by several orders of magnitude, leading to the destruction of human homes and lives. As people have suffered escalating losses to elephants, their permissiveness has given way to anger and frustration. Every year thousands of hectares of agricultural crops are destroyed by elephants looking for food.

In some countries, governments have taken drastic or expensive measures to minimize conflicts. Malaysia, for example, resorted to large-scale shooting of crop-raiding elephants in the late 1960's, and still translocates problem elephants to protected areas. Other countries, for example Indonesia, rely on short-term remedies such as capturing elephants for domestication. Where no immediate solutions are provided by governments or local authorities for lack of financial resources, people are increasingly taking the law into their own hands by shooting trespassing elephants.

Poaching. Poaching of Asian elephants for ivory, although far less significant than with African elephants, has played a role in reducing numbers in South Asia in the past, and is still a problem in parts of South India, Cambodia, Vietnam, Burma, and Laos. In South Asia, poaching also has altered the ratio of males to females in some areas, causing concern about genetic threats to the population. Skewed sex ratios may cause inbreeding, which can lead to genetic drift, reduce genetic diversity within a population, weaken resistance to epidemics, and compromise overall reproductive success. Poaching of Asian elephants of both sexes for meat, hide, bones and teeth is on the rise. Hide is turned into bags and shoes in Thailand and China, and bones, teeth and other body parts are used in traditional Chinese medicine to cure various ailments. In Vietnam, such poaching is a threat even to the remaining domestic elephants that are allowed to roam freely in forests.

Capture for domestication. Capturing elephants for domestication threatens wild populations, whose numbers already are greatly reduced, and inevitably results in mortalities. In Burma, the country with the highest demand for work elephants, there is some economic logic in capturing adults for use in the timber industry, rather than breeding elephants in captivity. An adult female elephant used for breeding would be unavailable for work curing her 2-year pregnancy and for up to 2 years afterwards, until her calf was weaned. Captive-born elephants then have to be nurtured for a full 10 years before they can be employed economically.

In other countries, however, there is less justification for taking wild elephants into captivity. In Indonesia, for instance, large numbers of elephants are being rounded up for domestication as a conflict resolution measure. There is no precedent in Indonesian culture for capturing and training elephants, and it was not until the 1980's that captive elephant managers began to acquire the skills and techniques required for such operations. Since that time over 600 elephants have been taken from the wild, with plans to remove another 600 over the next 5 years. However, elephants are not used in the logging industry, and only a limited number can be used for other purposes such as tourism. Therefore, the cost of capturing and maintaining these animals seems a misguided use of the meager conservation resources available in this country.

The Asian Elephant Conservation Act

The threat of extinction looms large for the Asian elephant. Conservation efforts by range country governments and international conservation groups have been underway for at least two decades. Unfortunately, economic and political stress has made it difficult for some countries to conserve their wildlife resources or to enforce protection laws effectively. Thus, the species finds itself in a precarious situation. If the Asian elephant is to survive in perpetuity, the international conservation community must work with range countries to meet these challenges head-on.

The conservation assistance provided by the Asian Elephant Conservation Act would be a significant step forward. A serious impediment to sustainable conservation measures for the Asian elephant is financial support. In many countries, national governments have demonstrated political commitment but many activities are

sidelined due to insufficient funding. Although the Asian Elephant Conservation Act will not single-handedly save the Asian elephant, it would serve three key purposes. First, the fund would provide a modest but vital source of support for on-the-ground projects to benefit the Asian elephant and its habitat. Second, it would generate matching funds from other sources for priority activities, and as with the African Elephant Conservation Fund, would leverage funding commitments from other governments and organizations. Third, through this bold initiative, the United States sends a strong message to the governments of the range countries that the plight of the Asian elephant is not merely a domestic concern—that even a country with no elephants of its own cares deeply about the survival of this remarkable species.

WWF believes that an investment strategy for conserving the Asian elephant should first concentrate on preserving habitats still large and intact enough to support healthy elephant populations over the long term, and on establishing habitat corridors between these important areas. The Asian Elephant Conservation Act could provide the following benefits directed toward these goals:

1. Conserving priority habitat areas for Asian elephants across their range. The Asian Elephant Conservation Fund provides a source of support for protection of the remaining elephant populations and their habitat against further loss and degradation. WWF and other international conservation organizations such as the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) have been working to identify priority elephant habitat throughout the species' remaining range, and to promote establishment and management of corridors and special protected areas. To secure the future of Asian elephants, it is necessary to identify and evaluate the remaining habitat areas where the prognosis for long-term survival is most promising, and then invest conservation resources preferentially in these areas.

WWF is currently supporting an assessment by two of the world's foremost experts on the Asian elephant, Dr. Raman Sukumar and Dr. Charles Santiapillai, often to 15 habitat areas where Asian elephants have the best chance of long-term survival. This evaluation will be based on population size, habitat integrity, proximity to major human settlements, and the degree of threats such as poaching, logging, and conversion to agriculture. Dr. Sukumar will explain in his testimony how the project will generate a predictive model of where conservation investments would have the best returns for elephants and where land might be acquired for new elephant reserves. I mention this to demonstrate that these high-priority areas, once identified and assessed, would be prime targets for the types of intensive conservation efforts that the Asian Elephant Conservation Fund could support. With a concrete display of US support, Asian range countries could conduct planning and management activities they once could not afford in order to protect elephants and their habitat.

2. Promoting co-existence between people and elephants by developing and implementing sound management practices that would prevent or reduce conflict. The Act specifically recognizes the need for programs and projects to address the conflicts between elephants and people that arise from competition for the same habitat. National governments and conservation organizations have conducted surveys and sociological studies in a number of Asian countries to document recent human/elephant conflicts and develop methods to minimize these often deadly encounters. Because elephants are wide-ranging animals, it is not always possible to set aside reserves sufficiently large to prevent their migration beyond borders and keep them segregated from human communities. But compromises are possible that could benefit both sides. For example, buffer zones can be established at the perimeter of protected areas where local people can pursue economic activities that are compatible with elephant conservation. Revenue from ecotourism can be channeled into community development projects such as building hospitals and schools. Local farmers can be compensated for crops lost to raiding elephants. The current resources of international conservation groups are grossly inadequate to address the problem of human/elephant conflict. The Asian Elephant Conservation Fund could provide desperately needed seed money and matching funds, in partnership with local and international groups, to greatly expand the range of activities to mitigate the struggle between people and elephants.

3. Promoting effective law enforcement. WWF is also encouraged that the Act points out the need for projects to enhance compliance with CITES and other laws to curb the illegal taking and trade of Asian elephants. While the Asian elephant does not face the same degree of threat from trade as the African elephant, poaching for ivory, skin, and other parts continues, and the recent CITES downlisting of African elephant populations in Botswana, Namibia, and Zimbabwe must be monitored closely to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on Asian elephant populations. The Asian Elephant Conservation Fund would provide an opportunity to create or

expand projects to strengthen compliance with CITES and to encourage greater participation by local communities in efforts to protect elephants. It also could support review and strengthening of elephant conservation legislation in the range countries as well as training of law enforcement personnel in methods for investigating and prosecuting violators. Anti-poaching patrol teams that monitor and protect elephants are an indispensable component of any elephant protection effort and are always in short supply. Such teams could be trained, armed and equipped by the fund.

4. Promoting greater scientific understanding of the Asian elephant. As Dr. Sukumar's work illustrates, there remains a need for greater scientific understanding of the dynamics of Asian elephant populations and their conservation requirements. Using GIS and field surveys, researchers have identified some parameters and basic needs, but again, resources are scarce. This is another area directly addressed in the Act where support from the United States could prove immediately beneficial.

Matching Funds. A common theme mentioned throughout has been the Act's role as a catalyst for generating matching contributions to Asian elephant conservation projects. As with the African Elephant Conservation Fund and the more recently established Rhino and Tiger Conservation Fund, we anticipate that a major component of the Asian Elephant Conservation Fund's success would be its ability to leverage funding from other sources. For example, since 1990, projects supported by the African Elephant Conservation Fund have received close to $6 million in matching contributions, which surpasses the value of grants made directly from the fund. WWF has over 30 years of experience in Asian elephant conservation. Working in nine of the 13 range countries, WWF has invested close to $5 million in recent years in projects to protect Asian elephants and their habitat.

Similarly in Asia, private conservation groups, local governments, and others have many ideas for programs and projects, but cannot bear the costs alone. With seed money or matching grants from the fund, however, many more such initiatives could be brought to life. WWF is encouraged that the legislation promotes such partnerships by giving priority to those projects with the potential for some measure of matching funds. Through the fund's well-conceived emphasis on small grants, cooperation with range countries and private partners, and a balanced set of priorities for on-the-ground projects, it will clearly have an immediate positive impact.

Before concluding, Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise one cautionary note. WWF strongly believes that funds for an Asian Elephant Conservation Fund should not affect the modest funds currently earmarked for the African Elephant Conservation Fund or the Rhino and Tiger Conservation Fund. Though these species face some common threats, their situations also are distinct, and the ultimate success of efforts to save all of them will require individual attention and investment. Different habitat requirement, different threats to their survival, and different management needs all present a rationale for separate funds dedicated to the conservation of each species. Moreover, concern for the Asian elephant's survival is heightened in the aftermath of the CITES conference last month, the decisions related to possible future resumption of the ivory trade, and the potential impact on the Asian elephant. We urge the Congress to recognize that, while it has created a powerfully effective model by which the United States can contribute to the conservation of flagship and keystone wildlife species, the conservation benefits to each species will be compromised unless each receives a full and separate appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, once again the international community finds itself in a position where quick action is the only hope for preserving two of the world's biologically and culturally important species. The Asian Elephant Conservation Act is a critical piece of legislation that WWF believes will greatly benefit this species and countless others which share its habitat. Similarly, the African Elephant Conservation Act, with its proven track record of successful on-the-ground projects, provides key support for countries desperately in need of conservation assistance. WWF salutes the sponsors of this legislation for showing important global leadership for the conservation of the world's wild elephants. We hope Congress will see the enactment Asian Elephant Conservation Act and reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act as important and practical steps towards securing the future of these magnificent species for generations to come.

KEY WWF PROJECTS FUNDED BY THE AFRICAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION ACT

In Central Africa

Central Africa is home to as many as a half of Africa's elephants—the forest elephants. The establishment of protected areas in this region lags far behind that of southern and eastern Africa, and heavy poaching continues to pose a serious prob-

lem. Funding provided by the FWS has provided the impetus for the establishment of a network of such protected areas, and has leveraged funds from WWF and the Wildlife Conservation Society, as well as generous funding from the Dutch and German governments and the European Union. As a result, notable progress has been made in protecting the elephant populations in the region. WWF has been working in the following areas on the projects described below.

Dzanga-Sangha Dense Forest Special Reserve and Dzangha-Ndoki National Park Central African Republic

The southwestern region of the Central African Republic (CAR) contains the country's last stronghold of the diverse lowland tropical forest characteristic of central Africa, which is home to a significant population of elephants. The government of CAR and WWF have worked together to create a multiple use reserve (Dzangha-Sangha) and national park (Dzangha-Ndoki) to protect this unique ecosystem. This project seeks to integrate wildlife protection, tourism, research, training, rural development and preservation of the cultural integrity of the Baaka pygmies to conserve this valuable forest. The FWS has supported elephant protection, ecological monitoring and coordination in the Dzangha-Sangha project for nearly 6 years. The anti-poaching operations supported by FWS include a force of 30 guards and have resulted in a marked decrease in poaching and a significant increase in the elephant population, and the recorded density of 3. 18 elephants per square kilometer is one of the highest—if not the highest—ever recorded in the forests of Africa. Over 2,000 individual elephants have been observed at the Dzangha clearing, and only rarely are elephants shot in the park.

A major focus of this project has been the participation of local people; it is one of the first conservation initiatives in the lowland tropical forests of Africa to integrate conservation with the needs of the rural poor. As such, it serves as an important prototype for future community conservation efforts in Central Africa, in which local people realize direct benefits from wildlife conservation.

The objective of the project—to stop large scale poaching of elephants in the core area of Dzangha-Sangha—has clearly been reached. FWS support has made it possible to maintain an active anti-poaching effort that has resulted in an expanding elephant population—a situation that is unique in the central African region. Clearly, the steps that have been taken are working, and need to be continued in order to keep protecting this important elephant population.

Gamba Protected Areas Complex—Petit Loango Reserve Gabon

In April 1990, WWF joined forces with the FWS to provide emergency support for the conservation of elephants and other wildlife in the Petit Loango Game Reserve in Gabon. The reserve has a great diversity of habitats and species, covering 500 square kilometers of seashore, mangrove, swamp and tropical forest. Established in 1966, the reserve is a priority site for elephant conservation.

Recent increases in poaching for meat and ivory pose an immediate and severe threat to elephants in the reserve. Under this project, which is ongoing, an anti-poaching unit has been sent to patrol the area and to meet with rural communities to explain the problems associated with poaching. These measures are designed to give the government the time to develop a long-term conservation program for Petit Loango and adjoining areas in the entire 10,000-square-kilometer Gamba Reserve Complex. Emergency anti-poaching efforts such as those at Petit Loango are buying time—time needed to develop sound, long-term conservation and development programs that demonstrate conservation benefits to communities and, in so doing, enlist the critical support of local people to reduce poaching. Bangassou elephant censusing project Central African Republic

Little information has been available on the status of elephant populations in the Bangassou forests of southern CAR, but there have been reports of high elephant density and heavy poaching in the area. The purpose of this project—which began 3 years ago, and is near completion—is to estimate the numbers and distribution of elephants and chimpanzees remaining in those forests, to assess the impact of ivory poaching, and to assess the general conservation potential of the forests. Such surveys and analyses are the precursors to establishment of protected areas.

In Southern Africa: Elephant conservation problems in southern Africa are increasingly related to human-elephant conflicts, as elephant populations outgrow the available habitat within protected areas. However, poaching in parks, and disease outbreaks are still of concern and WWF has undertaken projects in the following areas.

Chobe National Park Botswana

WWF assisted the government of Botswana through the preparation of an elephant management plan for Chobe National Park in 1994. Chobe National Park is

one of the most significant protected areas in southern Africa. It has more that 400 wildlife species and protects habitat for one of the largest known elephant populations on the continent. Recent elephant population estimates for northern Botswana (with Chobe as an important core area) are 70,000—highlighting the importance of developing a management plan here.

Namibia Desert Elephants: anthrax outbreak

In response to an outbreak of anthrax in Namibia in 1993, approximately 30 desert elephant were inoculated against the disease with emergency funding from FWS. The Namibian elephant population is one of the most mobile on the continent, and it is very easy for an infectious disease like anthrax to wipe out a large population in a very short time. Namibia has approximately 10,000 elephants chat could have been threatened by the disease had it not been caught in time. In addition, elephant populations in neighboring countries also could have been susceptible to the disease.

In addition to protecting the entire elephant population of the region, it was particularly important to protect the small population of approximately 50 desert elephants, as this population is unique in that it has developed characteristics that allow it to survive in the desert.

Anti-poaching unit Zambia

Zambia is home to approximately 25 ,000 elephants, and at the inception of this project in 1991, poaching was a serious threat. Under this project, WWF helped the Zambian government establish an anti-poaching unit, which resulted in a significant breakthrough in the fight against poaching. Several poaching rings were broken and many individuals were arrested and prosecuted.

The international headquarters for the World Wildlife Fund has also received support through the African Elephant Conservation Fund for projects in Cameroon to assess the impact of crop raiding elephants, and elephant related research in Kenya. In addition, the TRAFFIC office in Malawi, a joint program of WWF and IUCN, has received funds to monitor the ivory trade and has undertaken a survey to quantify existing ivory stockpiles. We would be pleased to provide the committee the details of these projects upon request.

The Future

Priorities for future WWF projects for which we will seek funding under the African Elephant Conservation Fund will focus on surveys of elephant populations and establishment of additional protected areas for the forest elephants in central Africa. Central Africa is many years behind east and southern Africa with respect to the establishment of protected areas in which elephants can find refuge, yet as many as half of Africa's elephants live here. The Dzangha-Sangha project would serve as a model for future WWF work in the region. It would be our goal to establish a more expansive system of protected areas in central Africa and in doing so, to involve local communities and make them partners in the effort to protect elephants.

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND,
November 18, 1997.

THE HONORABLE JOHN H. CHAFEE, *Chairman,*
Senate Environment and Public Works Committee
Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC. 20510,

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On November 4, I testified before the committee at a hearing on the reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act and authorization of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act. At the hearing, The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) made misleading and erroneous statements regarding use of monies from the African Elephant Conservation Fund by programs associated with World Wildlife Fund. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify these statements on behalf of World Wildlife Fund, and I would like for this letter to be included as part of the record.

The Humane Society's written testimony by Dr. John Grandy notes on page ten that grants from the African Elephant Conservation Fund for two specific projects "have been used to support or enable the resumption in the international trade in ivory and elephant trophy hunting." The HSUS claims that the first project mentioned, the IUCN report *Four Years After the CITES Ban: Illegal Killing of Elephants, Ivory Trade, and Stockpiles*, concluded that "since the CITES ivory trade ban did not stop poaching completely, it therefore had failed." This is a false and misleading statement. Moreover, it ignores an overarching conclusion from the re-

port: that, in real terms, African wildlife department budgets have declined dramatically—90 percent or more in some cases—since the 1989 ivory trade ban went into effect, and that this development has been a significant factor leading to continuing, and possibly increasing, elephant poaching in some countries. In addition, the data and analysis presented in the report stand as a reliable source of information on poaching and ivory confiscation trends, and they have not met with any credible published challenge.

The Humane Society's testimony further states that African Elephant Conservation Fund monies provided to TRAFFIC's East/Southern Africa office were used to "assist that office in the development of a database on ivory stockpiles. . . which allowed TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa to develop an 'ivory stock database management system' that was used by the government of Zimbabwe to support its 1997 CITES proposal to resume trade in elephants form Zimbabwe." WWF would like to clarify that no funds from the African Elephant Conservation Fund have been used by TRAFFIC for the Zimbabwe ivory stock database project. AECA funds have been provided to TRAFFIC for a project to identify, register, and monitor ivory stocks throughout Africa. This initiative has not only aided implementation of CITES Conference resolutions and helped advance the African Elephant Range States Dialogue, it also has generally served to promote a climate of accountability and transparency for ivory stock management within Africa. While TRAFFIC has undertaken a capacity-building project with Zimbabwe's Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management to improve their ivory stock management capabilities, no AECA funds have been directed at that initiative.

Finally, World Wildlife Fund would like to include for the record copies of two recent letters from the Kenya Wildlife Service which provide clarifying information on recent elephant poaching trends in that country, reports of which have been distorted in the press.

Thank you for this opportunity to clarify these statements made in the testimony of The Humane Society of the United States, and to provide additional information to the committee. Please contact me at (202) 778–9605 if you have any questions.

GINETTE HEMLEY,
Director, International Wildlife Policy.

KENYA WILDLIFE SERVICE,
Nairobi, Kenya, August 6, 1997.

TO: NINA MARSHALL
RE: ELEPHANT POACHING

The report you faxed to me from Ron Orenstein of the International Wildlife Coalition giving information on purported poaching of elephants in Kenya refers.

During a meeting held on Monday, 4 August 1997 and attended by the Director and Security Chiefs of the organisation, it was reported that the information is incorrect and untrue. Kenya has a very sophisticated security system with special intelligence, investigation, and combat units spread all over the country. There is no way such activities would have gone unnoticed. We have done thorough checks on the round and have established that the information on the Internet is untrue. The KWS person quoted as the source of the information, Mr. Daniel Woodley, has denied that he gave out such data.

KWS is disappointed that Mr. Ian Redmond and Simon Trevors did not make any attempt to verify the very alarming information before releasing it to such a wide circulation network.

I hope I have clarified the position.

Thank you.

JOHN WAITHAKA,
Head, Species Programme.

KENYA WILDLIFE SERVICE,
Nairobi, Kenya, October 9, 1997.

THE EDITOR,
Sunday Telegraph,
United Kingdom.

DEAR SIR: I wish to respond to a report by Brian Jackman and Greg Neale in the 5 October edition of the Sunday Telegraph that more than 40 elephants have been poached in Kenya in the past six weeks, supposedly in response to a decision taken

by CITES in July to downlist elephant populations in Namibia, Botswana, and South Africa from endangered to threatened status.

The actual figures of elephants poached for meat as well as ivory since 1992, when good monitoring statistics began is: 1992—97; 1993—124; 1994—87; 1995—47; 1996—76; 1997 to date—53. Despite an average figure before the CITES meeting, the average monthly figure has been less than 4, will below the 1992–96 average of 8. There has not, in other words, been an increase in ivory poaching in recent months or years, despite elephants increasing at over 1,000 a year and spreading further from the protection of parks since 1990.

Kenya will make it known if there is any substantial change in ivory poaching rates.

Sincerely,

DAVIS WESTERN,
Director.

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. GRANDY, HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. Thank you for providing The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) with an opportunity to testify on S. 627, the African Elephant Reauthorization Act of 1997 and S. 1287, the Asian Elephant Conservation Act.

I am Dr. John W. Grandy, Senior Vice President for The HSUS, this nation's largest animal protection organization, which has more than 5 million members and constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to begin by thanking Senator Jeffords for his leadership over the years to enact legislation that protects the world's dwindling populations of elephants, rhinos and tigers. He has performed an invaluable service to Americans and others throughout the world by introducing these bills.

The HSUS strongly supports the African Elephant Conservation Act and the Asian Elephant Conservation Act but maintains some reservations about the distribution of funds appropriated through Congress.

Elephant species were once the dominant herbivores on most of the Earth's continents. Today, due primarily to climate change, only two species remain: the Asian elephant (*Elaphus maximus*) and the African elephant (*Loxodonta africana*). Although the two species are not related at the generic level and do not exist on the same continent, they share two common threats to their survival: habitat destruction and poaching for commercial purposes. As a result of these threats, wild populations of both species have declined precipitously over the past two decades. Asian elephant populations have declined from 75,000 to between 35,000 and 45,000, while African elephant populations have declined from 1.3 million to between 286,234 and 543,475 today (IUCN/African Elephant Specialist Group estimate).

While steady progress is being made to secure and increase elephant habitat, the situation regarding poaching of African and Asian elephants has just taken a turn for the worse.

In June 1997, over the objections of the United States and more than twenty members of the U.S. Senate, the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) decided to reopen the international trade in elephants and their parts and products from three southern African nations. The decision allows Zimbabwe, Botswana and Namibia to export live elephants and hunting trophies and, as early as March 1999, to sell stockpiled ivory to Japan if nine conditions are met to the satisfaction of the CITES Standing Committee. The decision also allows Zimbabwe, but not the others, to export ivory souvenirs and elephant hide. As a result, as of September 18, live elephants, hunting trophies, and elephant hides may be imported to the United States as long as they are accompanied by a CITES export permit from one of the three aforementioned African countries. Under CITES, the U.S. government has no role in approving such imports. However, thanks to the African Elephant Conservation Act, ivory souvenirs are banned from import and hence, Americans at least are not contributing to the souvenir trade in elephant ivory.

The HSUS would like to take this opportunity to thank the 23 members of the Senate, including many members of this committee, for writing to Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt on June 2, 1997, urging the United States to oppose the down-listing of the African elephant. Unfortunately, as predicted in your letter to Secretary Babbitt, the decision taken by the Parties may have already led to a surge in poaching of both African and Asian elephants. In just the past four months:

- In Ghana, two elephants were poached in Mole National Park. There had been no poaching in the Park since 1988. Source: Letter from B.K Volta-Tineh, Senior Wildlife Officer, Mole National Park, 28 August 1997.
- In Kenya, as many as 40 elephants have been killed. Included are between six and fifteen elephants killed in the Mukukodo forest near Samuburu reserve and five elephants poached at Muge Ranch, a private reserve near Nairobi. Source: Associated Press, 2 October 1997; The Sunday Telegraph (London), 5 October 1997.
- In Zimbabwe, six elephants were poached in July, as compared to an average of four per month in the six months prior to COP 10, according to Willis Makombe, acting head of the Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management. Source: AFP 14 September 1997.
- In Namibia, at least two elephants were killed in the West Caprivi Game Park. Source: The Namibian, 23 July 1997.
- In Zambia, twelve elephants have been poached in the lower Zambezi. Source: David Shepherd Conservation Foundation.
- In the Central African Republic's Manavo Grounds St. Floris National Park, 95 elephants were killed by Sudanese poachers who carried the ivory to Sudan in a caravan of 114 camels. Source: International Fund for Animal Welfare, 29 October 1997; The Electronic Telegraph, 31 October 1997.
- In the Democratic Republic of Congo, forty Sudanese poaching camps were discovered in Garamba National Park and an aerial survey counted carcasses of 30 elephants. Source: International Fund for Animal Welfare, 29 October 1997.
- In Egypt, ivory tusks are being offered for sale in Cairo and the claim is that they are from Sudan (there are no wild elephants in Sudan). Source: Care for the Wild International.
- In India, prior to 1990, 100 Asian elephants were poached per year, and this decreased to only 30 per year between 1990 and 1996 when the CITES ivory trade ban was in effect. But an estimated 150 elephants were killed in India in the first seven months of 1997, representing the death of about 10 percent of the breeding population. Sources: East Asian Conservation Centre and the Wildlife Protection Society of India; Associated Press, 31 May 1997.
- In The Netherlands, five Chinese citizens, traveling from Nigeria to Hong Kong, were intercepted at the airport in Amsterdam carrying a "huge quantity" of ivory and hides of protected animals. Source: AFP, 19 August 1997.
- In Taiwan, 130 kilograms of ivory were seized by police. The ivory was shipped from South Africa to Taiwan and was destined for Hong Kong and China. Source: CNA Daily English News Wire, 29 June 1997.

Mr. Chairman, these accounts are hauntingly reminiscent of the circumstances under which the African Elephant Conservation Act was passed. In 1987 when Congress first considered the Act, and in 1988 when the Act was passed, Americans had become alarmed by reports on the rapid decline of African elephant populations due to the ivory trade.

- Elephants numbers had dropped from about 1.3 million in 1979 to only 700,000 by 1988 and were declining by about 10 percent per year; by 1989 there were only about 600,000 elephants; today there are between 286,234 and 543,475 African elephants remaining, according to the IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group.
- In 1986 approximately 100,000 elephants were killed to satisfy the worldwide demand for ivory and at least 10,000 of those were used to supply the ivory for jewelry and other trinkets purchased by American consumers.
- Elephants had virtually disappeared from some areas of Sudan, Chad, the Central African Republic, and Zaire. In the Selous Game Reserve in Tanzania, elephants declined by 50 percent between 1977 and 1986; in Tsavo National Park in Kenya there was a 75 percent decline between 1972 and 1988.
- The average weight of a tusk being exported from Africa had declined from 35 pounds in 1979 to only 13 pounds in 1988, indicating that poachers were turning to younger and younger elephants, a particular concern since elephants do not reach sexual maturity until their early teens and then reproduce very slowly. In 1988, about 10–15 percent of tusks exported weighed less than 1 pound—tusks of infant elephants. Entire generations of older elephants were being wiped out by the ivory trade.
- The Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) had, in 1985, instituted a "CITES Ivory Control System" to regulate the ivory trade through marking of ivory and establishment of country-specific ivory export quotas. However, by 1988 the System was clearly failing to halt poaching and illegal trade because it was not implemented and enforced by

CITES Paries. Experts agreed that about 80 percent of ivory in trade in 1988 was taken from poached elephants.

- The prices paid for ivory increased from $2.25 per pound in 1960 to $68 per pound in 1988, indicating that ivory was being used as a commodity, like gold and silver, as a hedge against inflation. Elephants were being victimized by an upward spiral of supply and demand: the higher the price, the more elephants were slaughtered.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the African Elephant Conservation Act was passed primarily to address the ivory trade that was clearly, irrefutably driving elephants to extinction.

The Act, while expressing a desire to give the CITES Ivory Control System a chance to work, put in place a mechanism whereby the United States could unilaterally decide to stop the importation of ivory into the United States if it was discovered that this System was failing to control the ivory trade. In June 1989, eight months after the Act was passed, the Bush Administration imposed a ban on the importation to the United States of African elephant ivory under the provisions of the Act. At the time, the United States was one of the major markets for elephant ivory; about 30 percent of the ivory in trade was consumed by Americans.

This preceded by four months, and made a significant political contribution to, a decision by the more than 100 Parties to CITES, including the majority of African elephant range states, to ban the international commercial trade in ivory in October 1989. The reason that the Parties decided to ban the international commercial trade in ivory was that, despite an internationally coordinated CITES Ivory Control System, the trade proved uncontrollable and was driving elephants to extinction. The ivory trade was uncontrollable because it is highly lucrative for dealers who are highly organized, heavily armed, and well-connected to politicians who look the other way for a price; because elephants are largely unprotected in most of Africa and are so easily poached; and because Africa's destitute poverty makes it easy for dealers to find people willing to risk their lives to poach elephants. The ivory trade harmed both elephants and local people, while making a few ivory dealers and corrupt politicians rich.

Mr. Chairman, The HSUS sadly wonders how many more African and Asian elephants will be lost before it becomes clear that the down-listing the three populations of the African elephant under CITES was a mistake?

An additional concern is that, once ivory from the ivory stockrooms of Botswana and Zimbabwe is sold to Japan, there will be room for new ivory from culled elephants. Both Botswana and Zimbabwe claim enormous problems with human-elephant conflict and growing elephant populations which are causing people to ask for a political solution to crop-raiding elephants. In culling operations, entire elephant families are gunned down; traumatized infants are pulled away from their dying mothers and sold to circuses and zoos. The ivory is stockpiled, hide sold to make shoes and briefcases, and the meat is sold to crocodile farmers. As a result of the CITES decision, hides and infant elephants resulting from such culls could be imported to the United States. The HSUS opposes elephant culling as a means to control elephant populations and suggests a humane alternative, which we will address in the second half of our testimony.

Although the United States is not a member of the CITES Standing Committee (which will be evaluating whether the nine criteria that would allow Botswana, Namibia, and Zimbabwe to export ivory from their stockpiles to Japan have been met), the Senate should urge the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, to take whatever measures are possible to ensure that: 1) the CITES Panel of Experts confirms that enforcement and ivory trade control deficiencies are met by both the exporting countries and Japan; 2) all African and Asian elephant range states have been given an opportunity to comment before any commercial ivory export is permitted; 3) any mechanisms developed for re-listing the three populations of the species on Appendix I can be implemented quickly in the event of an increase in elephant poaching; 4) the Interpol Wildlife Crime Subgroup is involved in monitoring illegal ivory trade; and 5) the process is transparent and participatory.

Mr. Chairman, The HSUS also fully supports the portion the African Elephant Conservation Act that has set up the African Elephant Conservation Fund to support projects on research, conservation, management, or protection of African elephants. However, we have concerns about some of the types of projects funded under the Act which we will elaborate on in detail in our testimony. But first, I would like to describe for you some of the conservation, protection and research projects related to African elephants that are currently funded by The HSUS.

In 1993, we provided a $10,000 grant to the Owens Foundation for Wildlife Conservation for their work on the North Luangwa Conservation Project (NLCP) in Zambia and we have continued to leverage about $30,000 for the Foundation each

year through private granting agencies. The HSUS considers the NLCP to be a model program for combining wildlife conservation with development of rural African communities without resorting to consumptive use of wildlife.

In 1986, Mark and Delia Owens established the NLCP to rehabilitate, conserve and develop the 2,400 square mile North Luangwa National Park in Zambia. At that time, 1000 elephants were being killed in the Park each year by commercial meat and ivory poachers. In the previous 15 years, up to 100,000 elephants had been poached in the Luangwa Valley. Wildfires set by poachers had burned over 80 percent of the Park's vegetation every year. If left unprotected, North Luangwa would be sterilized by 1996.

The Zambian government had limited resources to protect or develop the Park. Therefore, the Owenses' first priority was to decrease poaching by improving the efficiency of the government Game Scouts. New equipment, housing, training and incentives were provided to the Scouts. After working closely with these men for years, the North Luangwa Scouts have been declared the best in Zambia.

At the same time the Owenses developed a plan to involve the local people in the conservation of their greatest resource, their wildlife. Poaching was the primary industry in the area, providing more jobs and more sources of protein than any other. Therefore, the Owenses began a Community Development Program of the NLCP that established small sustainable businesses that offer basic goods and services to the local people and provide alternative legal jobs to poachers. These services are not a free handout. Each business is based on the free enterprise system and the initial start-up loan must be repaid to the project so that new businesses can be started in the village.

In the past, many of the villagers could obtain ground corn, their staple diet, only by trading poached meat for it. Now the NLCP grinding mills provide this service for pennies and, at the same time, offer employment to millers, mechanics and bookkeepers. Villagers used to poach bush meat to trade it for cooking oil, a much prized commodity in rural Africa. NLCP has taught them to grow sunflower seeds and press oil using simple seed presses. Again, poaching is replaced by sustainable legal trade. Other cottage industries that have provided jobs, food or services to the local people are carpentry shops, sewing co-operatives and cobbler shops. In some villages, small shops are opened to provide simple goods to villagers such as matches, soap and salt. Farmers are assisted with seed loans, transportation and technical assistance. More than 2000 families in the NLCP target area are benefiting from NLCP's Community Development and Agricultural Assistance Programs.

The Owenses established the NLCP Conservation Education Program in fourteen remote villages near the National Park. Many students had never seen a color photograph and schools lacked the most basic supplies. The NLCP Education Officer visits schools monthly, weather permitting, offering a 500-volume mobile library, curriculum guidelines, school supplies, wildlife slide shows (powered by a gasoline generator), lectures, projects and contests. Forty-eight American schools participate in a conservation oriented exchange program with NLCP's students, exchanging letters, art work, reports and essays. American schools sent school supplies, books and donate magazines. These Zambian students will not grow up to be poachers.

NLCP's Rural Health and Family Planning Program teaches hygiene, first aid, preventative medicine, family planning and advanced clinical techniques to village medics. NLCP has trained and equipped 48 "Traditional Birth Attendants" to assist the pregnant women in the villages near the Park. The Attendants also teach AIDS prevention, early childhood development and nutrition to the women of their villages.

The ultimate goal of the NLCP is to ensure that tourism development in North Luangwa National Park will have a low impact on the environment and return revenue to the local villagers. Once the local villagers are benefiting legally from the National Park through tourism, there will be even less incentive to poach. The Owens have worked with the Zambian government to develop a plan for tourism in the Park.

The NLCP has been very successful. When the Owenses arrived, 1000 elephants were being poached each year. Between September 1994 and June 1997 not one had been poached. However, after nearly 6 years of almost complete protection, the elephant population of North Luangwa has not increased. This argues strongly for continued protection for the African elephant under a CITES moratorium on trade in elephant parts and continued funding by the U.S. government for research, management, protection, and conservation of African elephant populations. Twenty elephants have been collared with radio transmitters and aerial data is being obtained to chart their movements, habitat usage, and more.

Likewise, the people near the Park no longer have to poach to feed their families. Over 2000 families, many of whom were once involved with poaching, now have

legal, sustainable jobs. Leaders from villages outside the NLCP range are now coming to the Owenses and requesting their advice on how to start programs such as those implemented by the NLCP.

It is sad to note that, although for many years the Owens Foundation has applied for funding for the NLCP from the African Elephant Conservation Fund, and has apparently met all of the criteria for funding under the Act, the project has inexplicably not been funded to date. The NLCP operates on a comparatively small budget of approximately $500,000 per year, which is provided by the Frankfurt Zoological Society of Germany and the Owens Foundation for Wildlife Conservation. This is a successful project, which is conserving wildlife, including elephants and helping people, is worthy of funding under the Act.

In January 1997, HSUS along with Humane Society International (HSI), signed a US$1 million, 5-year agreement with the National Parks Board (NPB) of South Africa to conduct a study on the use of immuno-contraception as a means for controlling reproduction in elephants and humanely controlling the size and growth of elephant populations. Additionally, under the agreement, The HSUS/HSI will develop, promote and conduct ecotourism programs in South Africa. The NPB will undertake to extend the range of elephants in South Africa and will use the contraception program to control elephant population sizes if it is shown by research to be safe, feasible, economic, and appropriate. Additionally, the NPB will examine and implement other means of reducing conflicts between elephants and other wildlife and human interests, including fencing, and translocating elephants to other parks and protected areas in South Africa.

The elephant contraception experiment is being conducted in Kruger National Park, which is home to over 8300 elephants. Within the Park's fenced boundaries, rangers have culled about 600 elephants each year in an attempt to maintain a population of 7500 elephants. But widespread opposition to culling has led South Africa to consider alternative means for controlling elephant populations and providing more habitat for elephants. In May 1995, after a public debate on the Kruger National Park's elephant management policy, the NPB undertook a review of that policy. The NPB announced that no elephants would be killed in Kruger National Park in 1996, although the NPB retains its policy to allow elephants to be killed when necessary as a last resort. The moratorium has been extended through 1997.

The HSUS/HSI is sponsoring the program which is being conducted by a team of scientists from Zoo Montana, the Medical College of Ohio, the University of Georgia, and the University of Pretoria in South Africa. Dr. Jay Kirkpatrick, HSUS consultant for contraception and director of science and conservation biology at Zoo Montana, is leading the scientific research team. These organizations have joined with the South African NPB to administer a contraceptive vaccine to elephants in Kruger National Park.

This vaccine, the PZP (porcine zona pellucida) immunocontraceptive vaccine, was first developed in the 1970's, and works by stimulating the immune system to produce antibodies that block pregnancy. Since its development, PZP has been tested and adopted by the National Park Service for management of wild horses on Assateague Island National Seashore, Maryland; successfully tested by The HSUS and the Bureau of Land Management on wild horses in Nevada; successfully tested by The HSUS in collaboration with the National Park Service on white-tailed deer at Fire island National Seashore, New York; and is currently being used on over 90 species in 60 zoos and aquaria throughout the world.

Before allowing this technique to be tested on wild, free-ranging African elephants, the research team vaccinated three female zoo elephants with PZP. These elephants, which were not mated, showed the strong immune response to the vaccine that is required for successful contraception. Before taking the vaccine into the field, the research team also showed that antibodies produced in response to the PZP vaccine would prevent sperm from attaching to elephant eggs in the laboratory.

Between October 2 and 12, 1996, the research team and staff from Kruger National Park captured, radiocollared, and treated with PZP 21 adult female elephants in Kruger. Twenty additional animals were radiocollared but left untreated to act as controls. Before treatment, non-pregnancy of each animal in the study was confirmed with ultrasound. In November 1996, the 21 experimental animals were successfully given booster shots using PZP-containing darts fired from an airborne helicopter. The research team delivered a third shot to treated elephants in June 1997. We emphasize that, for the purposes of this research, once the elephants have been marked the vaccine can be delivered without ever capturing them again.

Unfortunately, there has been some confusion between The HSUS/HSI sponsored immunocontraception project and a concurrent elephant contraception project being carried out in Kruger National Park by a German team from the Institute for Zoological and Wildlife Research in Berlin. This team placed implants containing a six-

month supply of the steroid hormone estrogen in the ears of a sample of adult female elephants. The HSUS/HSI and our research team strongly opposed this project, because, among other reasons, we believed that the estrogen implants would lead to prolonged and sustained estrus in implanted females. We have received preliminary reports from our colleagues at the University of Pretoria that just such an effect is being seen among the elephants treated by the German research team. We stress, however, that no such indications have been reported for the PZP-treated elephants.

By early 1998, our research team will carry out pregnancy tests on the PZP-treated and untreated control elephants to determine the effectiveness of the PZP immunocontraceptive vaccine.

Should the vaccine prove effective as an elephant contraceptive, there are several reasons that it could be a useful management tool for free-ranging elephants. First, it can be delivered directly from the air without capturing the elephant. Second, the vaccine itself should be relatively inexpensive to produce. Third, non-pregnant females can be distinguished from the air with 85–90 percent accuracy by the age of calves accompanying them, a technique whose effectiveness was confirmed with ultrasound during the initial captures. Clearly, further research would be required to refine the vaccine, assess its effects on elephant health, reproduction, and behavior, and develop efficient techniques for delivering the vaccine to significant numbers of elephants.

Nevertheless, The HSUS/HSI feels that the PZP immunocontraceptive vaccine offers the promise of a practical, cost-efficient, humane alternative to the barbaric practice of destroying these magnificent, sensitive, and complex animals.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in reviewing the African Elephant Conservation Fund, The HSUS is distressed to learn that monies from the fund have been used to support or enable the resumption in the international trade in ivory and elephant trophy hunting.

Ivory trading

- Funds provided to the IUCN African Elephant Specialist Group (AESG) were used to support, in part, production of the widely criticized 1995 report, *Four Years After the CITES Ban: Illegal Killing of Elephants, Ivory Trade and Stockpiles*, which claimed that since the CITES ivory trade ban did not stop poaching completely, it therefore had failed.
- Funds provided to WWF enabled them to open an office of TRAFFIC in East/Southern Africa and to assist that office in the development of a database on ivory stockpiles. The ivory stockpile database allowed TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa to develop of an "ivory stock database management system" that was used by the government of Zimbabwe to support its 1997 CITES proposal to resume trade in elephants from Zimbabwe. In addition, the Director of this TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa was one of the primary authors of the aforementioned controversial report, *Four Years After the CITES Ban.*

It should be noted that, since 1989, the United States has supported the CITES ban on the international trade in ivory. Ironically, this negotiating position may have been undermined by these products of grants provided under the African Elephant Conservation Act. in addition, it should be noted that IUCN already receives funding in the amount of US$1 million per year from the State Department, which is as much as the annual U.S. contribution to the CITES treaty.

Trophy Hunting

- Safari Club International (SCI) received an $85,000 grant "to provide training in rural communities in the setting and monitoring of sustainable off-take hunting quotas, especially for elephants" (quote from the grant agreement). The project Is a component of Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE program which is based primarily on elephant trophy hunting. CAMPFIRE also is one of the most vociferous opponents of the CITES ivory trade ban and worked diligently to undermine the U.S. negotiating position on elephants at the June CITES meeting. Finally, it is important to note that when this African Elephant Conservation Act grant was provided to SCI in 1995, the CAMPFIRE program had already received at least $5 million in aid from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). This is five times the amount the African Elephant Conservation Fund receives annually from Congress. The HSUS considers USAID's and the African Elephant Conservation Fund's contributions to CAMPFIRE to be a waste of American taxpayer dollars.
- SCI received a $36,000 grant "to promote better wildlife management in the Republic of Tanzania through the use of standardized quotas that is designed to increase trophy hunting quality" (quote from the grant agreement).

- SCI received a $84,240 grant to conduct a survey of Tanzania's elephant populations because "better wildlife management will produce better animals that are available for trophy hunting" (quote from the grant agreement). A survey was also necessary to fulfill the requirements of the Endangered Species Act for the importation to the United States of elephant trophies from Tanzania. A second grant was given to SCI for "Phase II" of this project.

Mr. Chairman, elephant trophy hunting is opposed by 84 percent of Americans (according to December 1996 nationwide poll conducted by Penn & Schoen Associates Inc.). The same percentage of Americans oppose U.S. foreign assistance being used for this purpose. None of the scarce funds available under the African Elephant Conservation Act should be used to promote or enable elephant trophy hunting. Trophy hunting is an industry like any other that should not receive government subsidies in the guise of conservation.

The HSUS is concerned that funds available under the Asian Elephant Conservation Act will be used to promote consumptive use of Asian elephants, including trade and trophy hunting. There is certainly a demand for live Asian elephants in the public display industry, for use as breeders, performers or for display. Asian elephant ivory is widely traded in Asia. Although the import of Asian elephant hunting trophies is currently not allowed, SCI has urged the Service to allow the importation of trophies of even rarer species such as cheetahs, a critically endangered species with fewer than 10,000 individuals remaining in the wild. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recently made a non-detriment finding for the import of cheetah trophies from Namibia, although it has not yet issued any import permits for such trophies. The HSUS speculates that if the Service supports trophy hunting of this rare species, Asian elephants cannot be far off.

RECOMMENDATION

The Senate should amend the African Elephant Conservation Act and Asian Elephant Conservation Act, or provide guidance to the Department of the Interior, to ensure that funds from the Acts do not support projects or programs: a) that advocate or enable the ivory trade; b) that are based on, promote, or enable elephant trophy hunting or other elephant-based industries; or c) that promote or enable captive breeding of elephants other than for release in the wild.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee for this opportunity to share with you our views about the African Elephant Conservation Act and the Asian Elephant Conservation Act.

STATEMENT OF STUART A. MARKS, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, SAFARI CLUB INTERNATIONAL

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today.

My name is Stuart Marks. I am Director of Research and Community Development for Safari Club International. I have a Ph.D. in animal ecology and have taught anthropology. Having grown up in rural central Africa where my parents were medical missionaries, I have spent some 30 years researching community uses of wildlife and assessing community-based wildlife programs. More to the point, I am the project administrator for a successfully completed African Elephant Conservation Act Grant. Support to CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe on behalf of SCI and have been associated with the grant since the inception of this project.

Safari Club International strongly supports S. 627, the reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act. In addition, SCI supports the passage of S. 1287, the Asian Elephant Conservation Act. The money appropriated under the authorization of these two Senate bills goes to the Secretary of the Interior for the administration of funds in support of conservation goals for a species which we all believe is important. We would like to thank Senator Jeffords for his leadership on these significant issues as well as you Mr. Chairman for holding this hearing. While SCI supports the passage of both bills, our testimony today will focus specifically on the African Elephant Conservation Act and the ways in which our organization has enhanced elephant conservation in Africa.

Currently, SCI administers two ongoing African Elephant Conservation Act (AECA) grants in Tanzania. In addition, SCI has just successfully completed another grant in Zimbabwe. I begin with the Zimbabwe project for it allows us to specify concrete outcomes and goals supported under the AECA grant program and to clarify SCI's objectives for participating in these significant conservation projects.

The Zimbabwe AECA grant is for $85,000 in support of the CAMPFIRE program [CAMPFIRE stands for Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous

Resources whose objectives and goals are determined by residents within Zimbabwe]. The total project exceeds $150,000 in costs and is collaboratively administrated by SCI in conjunction with Zimbabwe's Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (DNP&WLM), the CAMPFIRE Association, World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), and Zimbabwe Trust (ZimTrust). The project was initiated by conservation concerned citizens within the host country who in terms of skill, resources, and time contributed far more to the project than the above monetary figures indicate. So my first point is to indicate that these grants facilitate cooperative efforts among a range of host country organizations which participate together to conserve elephants and their habitats.

Secondly, by demonstrating that harvesting of small quotas of wildlife can restore and maintain an appropriate balance in biodiversity, CAMPFIRE programs demonstrate that local management of wild resources, coupled with property rights and economic incentives, do serve the interests of both human development and biodiversity conservation. CAMPFIRE programs not only provide economic incentives to tolerate and sustain wildlife, in this case particularly elephants, but also help erase the stigma of earlier colonial institutions while promoting those of rural development. The Zimbabwe AECA grant provides the means by which local communities can make their own assessments and evaluations of wild resources as they are empowered through institutions to sustain these processes. The ultimate aim of CAMPFIRE is for wildlife, including elephants, to be managed at the community level. Given the colonial and centralized past history of wildlife management, this decentralization is indeed a lofty and progressive goal. To succeed, several key elements must be in place. Notable among these elements are suitable methodologies to assess the size of the resources, the setting and monitoring for appropriate quotas, as well as other activities such as wildlife protection, habitat management and ultimately the marketing of products to pay the "opportunity cost" for conservation to the community. The outputs from this project are impressive: the writing, fieldtesting, and production of quota setting and teaching exercise manuals that are readily understood by villagers. The project held 13 workshops in 10 districts attended by some 363 participants. Upon returning to their respective wards and villages, these participants are expected to train a cadre of local managers to assess, set quotas, and protect wildlife habitats and populations.

SCI is an organization of conservationists who hunt. Just as sportsmen continue to pay for conservation in our own country, SCI's contributions make possible conservation and management of wildlife in many lands. In addition to the millions of dollars which our members contributed directly through the purchases of hunting licenses around the globe, we spend millions of dollars nationally and interntionally on conservation projects. At indicated by our projects under the AECA program, elephant conservation is one of our organization's primary objectives.

Unlike other African countries, elephant populations in both Zimbabwe and Tanzania, which are both hunted populations, have increased in recent years. Attention to assessing elephant populations and allowing quota offtakes from these populations (mainly bulls and rogue animals) allows for sustainable uses and support for conservation programs. That's what the two AECA grants in Tanzania are about.

The initial AECA grant in Tanzania is for $84,240 which is to help fund a basic survey of that country's elephant populations, which may turn out to be the largest in Africa. The total cost for this project is for $216,110, the balance of which, like that for Zimbabwe, is made up by resources and contributions from other donor and host organizations. This grant finds an aerial survey in three specific areas completing the collection of data which will provide a new baseline for elephant populations within Tanzania.

The second grant in Tanzania is for $36,050, with a total project costs of over $60,000. This pilot program is to train government game scouts to gather elephant information which is pinpointed geographically using a hand-held Global Position System. Once trained in this methodology, these scouts accompany safari hunting parties into the field at the expense of the. hunter and accurately record important biological information useful for conservation purposes. Donor agencies, such as GTZ and conservation organizations, have adopted this approach as a model and use it elsewhere. A second grant of $25,950 (out of total project cost of $69,200) has been allocated to increase the number of scouts trained. Besides teaching game scouts about biological parameters, they also learn about these populations from the standpoint of trophy quality (one aspect of economic importance to conservation funding). This is important because it maximizes the revenues that can be obtained from the sustained use of this natural resource, while minimizing the biological impact of the program. The revenues generated through the legal hunting of elephants are a key incentive to conservation, both at the national and local levels.

The African Elephant Conservation Act was enacted to conserve elephants. In cooperation with various conservation organizations and ministries, this program provides both means and incentives for African range nations to actively manage their natural resources including elephants. As demonstrated by these four grants administered through SCI, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service is appropriately addressing the concerns of rural people and the needs of the elephant, both of which will lead to the elephants survival.

SPORT HUNTING OF ELEPHANTS: AN ASSET FOR WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

THE CASE OF ZIMBABWE

Brief Summary

As the largest land-mammal, elephants present particular challenges to conservationists. Not only do they require large areas, they can transform these environments. Whether they Inane with elephants or at a distance, people are differently disposed towards these magnificent mammals. Reconciling these human differences demands creative management.

Unlike elsewhere in Africa, elephant numbers in southern Africa have risen dramatically. These increases have occurred despite offtakes from culls and from sport hunting. Sport hunting is selective and takes only a small portion of an elephant population. As a lucrative industry, safari hunting requires limited investments in capital and infrastructure yet is capable of generating large amounts of revenue for national and local economies. Through programs such as CAMPFIRE, this revenue reaches villagers where it supports and sustains enterprises and developments in rural areas.

The Challenge

Elephants are marvelous and wonderful creatures. Like people, they are dominant land mammals with great abilities to modify the structures and compositions their environment as well as to influence the well-being of other species with which they co-exist.[1] High densities of elephants generate rippling effects throughout an ecosystem. Elephants can cause reduced biological diversity together with losses in productivity and in soils.[2] Elephants can generate substantial wealth through ecotourism and sport hunting or contribute to depressive poverty through their depredations on local agriculture.[3]

People around the world are divided in their commitments to elephants—at either extreme, they either love or hate them. Most urbanites in the Western (Northern) world tend to value elephants positively by ascribing to them benign traits similar to their pets. Rural Africans, who live and make a living from environments where elephants occur, describe these large creatures im different terms. For them, elephants are capricious pests, destructive of property, food, and lives yet whose existence as a sustainable and renewable resource may offer mitigating circumstances for co-existence. Any sustainable management of elephants must reconcile these polarities in human. commitments, activities, and values. These negotiations are pivotal for establishing a new balance between human and environmental spheres in Africa. Such a balance involves rethinking many of the older ideas and preconceived "truths" while providing a framework for evaluating the differing circumstances within each management situation. Both require money and commitment.

Parks and reserves are neither static nor isolated islands. Through time, both their habitats and species change. Elephants and other wildlife frequently range beyond these borders. Consequently, the number of elephants in any protected area depends upon its neighboring humans' opinions and tolerance. Adjacent landowner and commonly attitudes are conditioned by their past histories as well as by their evaluations of the benefits/losses of having elephants around.

---

[1] Ngoma, L. Elephants and termites destroy vegetation. *The Zimbabwe Herald*, April 7, 1997; p. 4.

[2] Laws, R.M., I.S.C. Paper, and R.C.B. Johnstone (1975) *Elephants and Their Habitats*. Oxford: Claredon Press.

[3] Hoare, R. (1994). Towards a problem animal control strategy involving communal land safari operators. pp. 19–33 in M.A. Jones (ed.) *Safari Operations in Communal Areas in Matabeleland*. Harare: Dept. of National Parks and Wild Life Management Hoare indicates that Problem Animal Control (PAC) is a perennial issue in Zimbabwe. In Binga District, PAC type incidents were 78 percent crop damage, 9 percent threats to humans, 3 percent property damage, and 10 percent livestock damage. Elephants alone accounted for 87 percent of these reports. Safari operators and sport hunters are often called upon to kill these difficult animals and to help compensate for human losses.

A widespread is that communities of rural people will tolerate elephants and other wildlife only if they receive more benefit than they suffer from its presence.[4] Projects exploring these links between conservation and development have been established and supported by foreign donor assistance in a number of African countries. To name a few, countries with active community based management programs include Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Namibia, Tanazania.[5]

In many parts of southern Africa, the financial returns from wildlife viewing outside of protected areas is insufficient to promote conservation and management practices there.[6] On the other hand, safari hunting of selected elephant provides sufficient financial returns for conservation particularly on private lands.[7] How hunting generated funding is used, which people benefit, end whether these revenues are adequate to ensure attitudes promoting the survival of ecosystems and wildlife on communal lands are the contentious issues.

Within Zimbabwe, CAMPFIRE[8] was developed to give rural communities direct responsibility for managing their natural resources. The main source of revenue generated by this program is through safari sport hunting, particularly that of elephants.[9] This paper reviews recent information on the safari hunting of elephants within Zimbabwe, and briefly elsewhere, to document its current contribution to and potential for wildlife conservation and management.

Population histories of some southern African elephants

Within southern Africa, elephants have experienced different histories which are expressed in their current population structures. In Zimbabwe, the elephant population has steadily increased for almost 100 years. In 1900, this population was estimated at 4,000 animals.[10] By 1960, there were 32,700 elephants and by 1988 their numbers had reached 52,000 animals. This rate of increase was achieved. despite the fact that some 44,500 elephants were culled during this interval to prevent them from damaging the habitat in some areas.[11] An aerial survey in 1995 estimated approximately 64,000 elephants within Zimbabwe.[12] In contrast, elephants within both Tanzania and Zambia have recently experienced declines during the 1980's.[13] At least in Tanzania, elephant numbers appear to have stabilized and show slight increases for the 1990's.[14] In both of these latter countries, the elephant population is currently comprised mostly of the younger age classes for both sexes. Elephant populations increase and decrease for many different reasons. Most authorities

---

[4] Murphree, M W. (1994) The role of institutions in community-based conservation pp. 403–27 IN David and Weston and R.M. Wright (eds.) *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-Based Conservation*. Washington: Island Press.

[5] For example, see Kiss, A. (ed.) (1990) *Living with Wildlife. Wildlife Resource Management with Local Participation in Africa*. Washington, DC: The World Bank, Brown, M. and B. Wyckoff-Baird (1992) *Designing Integrated Conservation and Development Projects*. Washington: DC. Biodiversity Support Program and World Wildlife Fund: International Institute for the Environment and Development (199?) *Whose Eden? An Overview of Community Approaches to Wildlife Management*. London: IIED and Overseas Development.

[6] Child G. (1995) *Wildlife and People: the Zimbabwean Success*. Harare and New York: WISDOM Foundation.

[7] Jansen D. I. Bond, and B. Child (1992) *Cattle, Wildlife, Both or Neither: Results of a Financial and Economic Survey of Commercial Ranches in Southern Zimbabwe*. WWF Multispecies Animal Production Systems Project Report. Harare. 203 pp.

[8] CAMPFIRE is the acronym for the Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources—a major program which seeks to link rural development and biodiversity conservation.

[9] Ninety percent of the income for the 12 districts constituting CAMPFIRE between 1989 and 1992 came from sport hunting, 62 percent from the sport hunting of elephants. see Bond, I. (1994) *The importance of sport-hunted African elephants to CAMPFIRE* Zimbabwe TRAFFIC Bulletin 14(3), 117–18.

[10] This estimate ts based on numbers and potential rates of increase, see Cumming, D.H.M. (1981) *The management of elephant and other large mammals in Zimbabwe*. pp. 164–181 in Jewell, PA, S. Holt. and D. Hart (ed.) *Problems in Management of locally Abundant Wild Animals*. New York: Academic Press.

[11] Martin, R.G., C. Craig, and V. Booth (1989) *Elephant Management in Zimbabwe*. Harare: Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management, Zimbabwe.

[12] Price Waterhouse (1995). *Elephant Census Review in Zimbabwe, 1980–1995. An Analysis and Review*. Commissioned report by Government of Zimbabwe. The numbers of elephants removed from these herds is from Child. G. (1995) p. 95.

[13] Leader-Williams, N., S.D. Anon. and P.S.M. Berry (1990) *Illegal exploitation of black rhinoceros and elephant populations: patterns of decline, law enforcement and patrol effort in Luangwa Valley*, Zambia Journal of Applied Ecology 27:1055–1087.

[14] Personal Communication, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism. Republic of Tanzania.

agree that habitat destruction (in competition with humans) and illegal hunting are the most prominent causes for these recent decreases.[15]

Impacts of Sport Hunting on Elephants

Under CITES[16], export quotas for elephants, which are currently placed on Appendix 1, are set by each range country for numbers of tusks taken by sports hunters.[17] The current number of elephants for annual export from Tanzania is 50 (or 100 tusks) while that from Zimbabwe is 300 (600 tusks). The legal numbers of elephants taken by sports hunters and exported from either of these countries has never exceeded this quota and for most years has been well below this figure.[18] This information makes clear that sport hunting takes relatively small numbers of elephants.

The overwhelming majority of elephants taken by sports hunters are adult males. As their quarries, sports hunters prefer to select bulls which are past their prime breeding age and which spend most of their time either alone or in bachelor bands. The assumption is that these older males have contributed their traits and genes to the succeeding generations.[19] Other students of animal behavior question this assertion about trophy hunting. Their perspective begins by noting that elephants have an extremely skewed operational sex ratio with comparatively few suitable breeding males compared with the numbers of potentially receptive females. They argue that hunting for trophies may be weakening the genetic constitution of an elephant population by eliminating its most fit males while disrupting the transmission of critical survival skills to succeeding generations.[20] This issue over the relative values of older bulls has yet to be resolved, and may remain a bone of contention between two very different human perspectives.

Afar more serious problem is how to keep renumbers within an appropriate demographic balance within an environment. Elephants grow and mature slowly. While a significant component, mature adults normally constitute only a small proportion of an elephant population. One cannot reduce a wild population by taking males exclusively. The numbers of adult cows and juveniles of various ages and stages must be also managed—either by culling certain random groups or transporting them for release elsewhere. For elephants, either of these and other options are expensive and demand long range planning and strategic capabilities within wildlife manage-

---

[15] A recent analysis shows that both the illegal ivory trade and reduced carrying capacity were causing declines in the elephant populations of Africa and both needed their appropriate resolution. see Millneur-Guilland, E.J. and J.R. Beddington (1993) The relative effect of hunting and habitat destruction on elephant population dynamics over time. Pachyderm 17:75–90. See also Sugal, Cheri (1997) The price of habitat (In southern Attica, the increasing conflicts between elephants and humans is raising painful questions about cohabitation on a crowded planet) World-Watch (May/June): 18–27.

[16] CITES is the acronym far Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. Its secretariat notifies the Parties each year of their export quotas of wild species. See for example, CITES notification to the Parties. Export Quotas for 1996, dated 20 June 1996.

[17] The importing country determines whether or not to allow elephant trophies and tusks into its territory. For example, the United States currently allows its citizens to import elephant trophies from five countries: Zimbabwe, South Africa Namibia, Botswana, and Tanzania.

[18] In Tanzania, the CITES export quota has remained at 5O animals. From 1990 through 1994, the following consecutive elephants were shot by sport hunters 16, 12, 17, 23, 29 (Tanzania Dept. of Wildlife. see Table 3 in C.A. Mlay (1997) The history of the Tanzania ivory trade pre-Appendix I and the international ivory trade ban Mimeo paper from African Elephant Conference (Johannesburg, May 4–7, 1997). Based upon a quota of 300, Zimbabwe's annual take by sport hunters since 1984 (through 1992) has been as followers: 10, 13, 214, 190, 182, 199, 143, 186, 259 (Source: Zimbabwe Dept. NP&WLM).

[19] For example, Child (1995: pp. 207–208) cites the assumption and questions it, particularly for some antelopes such as sable and tsessebe, where the larger males establish breeding territories.

[20] The argument runs as follows: Males reach sexual maturity at about 12 years of age. They are forced out of the matrilineal herds because neither the adult cows nor bulls will tolerate them. Subsequently, young bulls join others of their sex to form bachelor bands for many years. Bulls begin to compete for estrus females when they come into musth at about 30 years of age. After several years of "sneak matings" when larger bulls are distracted or not present, the bulls enter a stage when they are more successful in breeding. Females preferentially mate with bulls aver 40 years of age, the age class also preferred and taken by trophy hunters: Therefore, the natural scarcity of these older males in elephant populations causes trophy hunters to have a much larger impact on a population than a percentage figure of take per population indicates. see Moss. C. (1988) *Elephant Memories: Thirteen Years in the Life of an Elephant Family*. New York: Fontana: Poole, J. (June 1989) The effects of poaching on the age structure and social reproductive patterns of selected four African elephant populations: final report to the African Wildlife Foundation. African Elephant and Ivory Information Service No. 2.

ment agencies.[21] Choice of actions depend upon the. decisions made in the range countries as to their purposes sought through management.

A country can manage its elephants and other wildlife species for many reasons. These reasons may range from cultivating maximum numbers of some species to preserving environments favorable for sustaining biological diversity. If a choice is made for high densities of elephants, caution must be exercised to prevent the collapse of habitats that occurred in Tsavo National Park during the 1960's and 1970's.[22] In the 1980's, Zimbabwe intentionally intervened in Hwange National Park to save its habitats from destruction from too may elephants.[23] Hithertofore, Zimbabwe's elephant management objectives have been to "have healthy populations of elephant in well conserved ecosystems in parks and reserves and as many elephants outside as the land can support and the landowners accept.[24]

Contributions of Sport Hunting to National Economies

In 1991, Safari Club International commissioned a survey to investigate the impacts of sport hunting of African elephants on conservation-based economic development, species management, and anti-poaching in selected African countries.[25] Both elephant hunters and government management agencies were. surveyed, primarily through questionnaires. Sport hunters are also tourists. In both their hunting and tourist activities, they contribute immense sums to national economies. For example in; 1991, elephant hunters estimated on average that they each spent US$42,595 during their stays in Tanzania and US$42,120 while in Zimbabwe. Of this amount US$4,040 was spent on government license and export fees in Tanzania and US$6,000 in Zimbabwe. These government fees went directly back into elephant management and conservation Beyond these government levies, each elephant harvested was estimated to enhance the national economy by ova US$42,000.[26] Each respondent was convinced that their elephant pursuits contributed significantly also to the economic well-being of local humus where they hunted. The table below shows the estimated revenue streams in selected countries from this survey.

Elephant Range State Sport Hunting Revenues (1991)

(From 1992 SCI Survey)

Range country	CITES quota	Hunter permits issued	Animals harvested	Average amount per hunt	Total revenue for elephants
Namibia	32	18	11	$54,934	$604,274
S. Africa	16	10	N.A	$41,128	$411,280
Tanzania	50	18	17	$42,595	$724,115
Zimbabwe	250	150	150	$42,120	$6,318,000

Similar gross calculations indicate the large amounts of incountry revenue generated through sports hunting. Using the number of game hunting permits issued in Tanzania and average daily costs, total earnings in Tanzania show an increase from US$4.6 million in 1988 to almost US$14 million in 1992.[27] Some national estimates have also been made for the contributions of the wildlife sector to the Zimbabwean economy. In 1992 all wildlife sectors contributed Z$852 million of the national economy (or about 3 percent of total Gross National Product). Sport hunting alone contributed some Z$52 million, all in foreign currencies.[28]

---

[21] Some implications of these culling possibilities are discussed in Child (1995: p. 195). A recent experiment of the Humane Society of the United States to effectively sterilize adult cows has ended in failure. See Project Backfires, Zimbabwe Herald (April 24, 1997) in which this experiment on cow elephants implanted with estrogen hormones in Kruger National Park ended when bulls perceived them to be in permanent extrus, or "heat."

[22] Parker I. and M. Amin (1983) *The Ivory Crisis*. London: Chatto and Windus

[23] see review of Ron Thomsan's new book, *Mahohboh*, by Brian Marsh in Man Magnum (June 1997) pp. 24–29.

[24] Child (1995): 97.

[25] Safari Club International (1992) *African Elephant: Critical evaluations and recommendation on proposed elephant endangered status and special rule*. Report implented by Domestic Technology International. Tucson, Arizona, mimeo.

[26] data from SCI (1992); Table 3.

[27] returns from Tourist hunting in Tanzania. Tanzanian Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife, mimeo. See also Bonner, R (1993) *At the Hand of Man: Peril and Hope for Africa's Wildlife*. New York: Vantage.

[28] Jensen, D. (1992) The role of wildlife in the economy in Price Waterhouse and Environmental Resources, LTD, *Wildlife Management and Conservation Project, Task 2: The Role of Wildlife in the Economy*. Report prepared for the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management, Zimbabwe.

Hunting and associated industries generate and contribute to many jobs both in rural and urban areas. One estimate is that the multiplier effect of hunting is 1.69—meaning that for every dollar invested. in hunting, downstream economic activates increase by 1.69.[29] The SCI sponsored survey showed that the average number of local people employed on each hunt was 18. This employment of rural people provided some US$10,800 in wages in addition to US$5,400 given in other goads and services. These hunting tourists also spent (on average per hunt) US$1,650 on internal transportation, US$1,115 on meals and lodging, US$2,680 on taxidermy, and US$1,000 on other purchases. In 1996, Chipimbi Safaris of Chiredzi estimated that for its hunts for plains game (lasting less than 10 days), safari operators spent daily Z$500 for the professional hunter, $200 on food and drinks, $200 on camp hire per client, and about $100 on consumables.

Flow of Sport Hunting Revenues through CAMPFIRE

Prior to CAMPFIRE, the legal contributions of wildlife to Zimbabwean rural economies were small. On most of Zimbabwe's communal lands, visibility for wildlife viewing is poor, transport is difficult, comfortable amenities few. These inaccessible conditions tend to favor sport hunting, provide greater financial returns per non-resident individual, and create less disturbance on biological and cultural landscapes than does typical tourism.[30] The annual gross revenue earned from wildlife is one of the key indicators used to describe the performance of CAMPFIRE program at the national level. Between 1989 and 1994, CAMPFIRE districts gained a total of Z$33,999,070 in revenues from wildlife uses. Of these funds, 93 percent came from sport hunting and only 2 percent from tourism.[31] On communal lands, the sport hunting of elephants contributed the most value. In 1992, elephant hunting contributed over 62 per cent of CAMPFIRE revenues.[32]

The main source of revenue to the CAMPFIRE program is from sport hunting contracts with private sector operators. The attachment (Figure 1) shows the main channels through which these funds flow from the sports hunting consumer down to the producer wards and their specified apportionments at different levels.

The CAMPFIRE program began in 1989 by granting "appropriate authority" to manage wildest to Guruve and Nyaminyami Districts. The number of CAMPFIRE districts increased to 12 by 1991 with a further 12 districts added in later years. Between 1989 and 1993, the number of wards increased from 15 to 92 and numbers of households from 7,861 to over 90,000. The annual revenues from wildlife increased from Z$743,699 in 1989 to Z$13,999,070 in 1994 (with 93 percent from sport hunting)[33].

The early guidelines for the allocator of gross revenues under the CAMPFIRE program allowed for a 15 percent retention as a Rural District Council levy, for 35 percent to wildlife management and for 50 percent devolvement to the producer communities. In 1992, the Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management (DNP&WLM) revised these guidelines so that 80 percent of revenues was for allocation to the producer communities with 15 percent retained within the District for wildlife management and 5 percent charged as a levy. The allocation of CAMPFIRE revenues from 1989 to 1993 averaged as follows: disbursed to the producer communities 54 percent; for management 22 percent; for Council 14 percent; Allocated 7 percent, and other uses 3 percent.[34] In 1995, the allocations showed that 62 percent of funds were dispersed to ward and village communities, with the following amounts retained by District Council—18 per cent for management activities, 5.3 percent for Council, 1.8 per cent for CAMPFIRE dues and 12.9 percent unallocated. Districts themselves varied from 50 to 79 percent in the amounts of funds disbursed to their "producer communities".[35]

Determining household benefits from CAMPFIRE is not a simple, straightforward task Under the CAMPFIRE program, the ward (groups of villages defined on the

---

[29] Kay, D. (1992) *Zimbabwe Tourism Development Programme, Regional Market Analysis*. Special report prepared for EXA (Paris: France). This same report suggests that tourism contributes 3.5 percent of the GDP and employs about 36,500 people.

[30] The tradeoffs between ecotourism and sport hunting are discussed in Bonner (1993): pp. 239–250.

[31] From CAMPFIRE Association Newsletter, Economics and Markets, July 1996.

[32] Bond, L. (1994) *The importance of sport-hunted African elephants to CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe*. TRAFFIC Bulletin 14 (3) 117–118.

[33] Bond I. (1996, Joy) CAMPFIRE economic and markets CAMPFIRE Association Newsletter.

[34] Anon (nd) The Zimbabwean experience: the distribution of benefits under the CAMPFIRE programme, 25 pp. mimeo (obtained from CAMPFIRE Collaborative Committee)

[35] Anon (1996?) CAMPFIRE Programme Expenditure Statement (1989–1995) "Producer Community" has a special meaning. Revenues from sport hunting are generally disbursed in those wards where mammals ar killed.

basis of population) by default has become the standard unit of benefit as villages are generally too small in area to maintain viable wildlife lands and too weak institutionally to form effective natural resource management institutions. Although same wards retain the option for household dividends, most revenues are used for ward projects. The numbers of households, and the distribution of human settlements within wards, often means that the wildlife benefits are diluted among a large number of households which neither live with nor impact upon wildlife.[36]

Contributions of Sport Hunting to Rural Communities

Although "cash on the table from wildlife" may be CAMPFIRE's most impressive symbol benefits from wildlife, as a commons resource, accrue mainly to rural communities at the level of the ward.[37] While still an option, cash payments to households are rare.[38] Given the national scope of CAMPFIRE, household benefits are not only difficult to measure, they are also misleading.[39]

A recent review of wildlife and cattle production systems in rural areas showed that, for most CAMPFIRE areas, wildlife revenues can only supplement traditional agro-pastoral activities.[40] This paper suggests that an analysis of community benefits must go beyond the individual level of formal economic tools to understand the many factors influencing the economics and effectiveness of wildlife as a competitive enterprise in rural districts. Rural economies are not completely monetarised and social and kinship networks play an important role in how livelihoods and survival strategies are constructed. In rural areas, cattle are the main competitor for range resources and these domesticated species are individually owned with benefits accruing directly to households. Yet, the CAMPFIRE program through its important contributions in building schools, electric fences, clinics, cattle dips, employment, and road maintenance, has contributed substantially to developing rural economies.

Each rural village elects its own development committee chairperson who sits on various ward committees. Some. wards have kept records of funds received and disbursed. These cash flow maps are revealing for the progressive learning inherent through the CAMPFIRE experience. Nenyunga Ward is comprised of 12 villages. In 1994, this ward earned Z$78,000 from wildlife. The committee allocated its revenue as follows: Z$43,760 for maintenance and wages of the electric fence around its homes and cultivations, Z$3000 for a school project Z$2160 for a dam, Z$3320 for road maintenance, and Z$5149 for meeting allowances, and the balance for other activities including, travel and subsistence.[41] Madzivadzvido Ward reported that it had spent the following amounts: for a caretaker Z$3,600, for labor compensation Z$1000, for anti-poaching Z$2000, for meeting allowance Z$3,240, for uniforms Z$4,000, for ward administration Z$7000, for transect counting of wildlife Z$1,080, and for fence maintenance Z$21,688. In addition, this ward had disbursed Z$29,000 to build a school, Z$49,800 to purchase and resell maize, Z$6,000 to purchase fence materials, Z$7,591.5 to replace stolen solar panels, and Z$45,000 to build a diptank. Flowing into rural communities, these revenue streams from sport hunting enable people living there to use their entrepreneurial skills to sustain and improve their livelihoods within these capacious and often difficult environments.

AFRICA RESOURCES TRUST,
November 6, 1997.

HON. JOHN CHAFEE, *Chairman*
Environment and Public Works Committee,
United States Senate,

---

[36] Anon. (nd)The Zimbabwean experience.

[37] Quote is from Child, B. (1991) *CAMPFIRE s rural development: the Beitbridge experience.* Joint Publication of DNP&WM and CASS, Harare: Zimbabwe, 89 p.

[38] Of the Z$10 million paid to ward between 1989 and 1993, only 10 percent was paid directly to households. see also Anon (nd) *An assessment of the financial benefits to households from CAMPFIRE.*

[39] One way has been to divide the ward dividend by the number of households which yields a figure representative of the financial benefit per household. This is not a measure of revenues distributed to households (which those units can use at will) and it presumes that all households benefit equally from the ward dividend. In wards wit low human densities, the potential for generating revenue from wildlife use may be substantial, however, this likely benefit is considerably reduce with a small increase in human population. Anon. (nd) An assessment of financial benefits.

[40] Bond, I. (1993) *The economics of wildlife and land use in Zimbabwe: an examination of current knowledge and issues.* WWF Project paper No. 36, Harare, Zimbabwe.

[41] Anon (nd) *Nenyunga Ward: Project: Analysis and Planning Workshop*: 15–16 August 1995. mimeo.

Washington DC.

DEAR SENATOR CHAFEE: Further to the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Drinking Water, Fisheries and Wildlife Hearing on the African and Asian Elephant Conservation Acts on November 4 1997, I would like to submit the following comments and documents for the record.

My comments relate specifically to claims made by the Dr. John Grandy of the HSUS before the committee of increases in elephant poaching since the CITES downlisting of the elephant populations of Zimbabwe, Botswana and Namibia and comments relating to the CAMPFIRE programme in Zimbabwe.

In relation to CAMPFIRE, having spent from 1990–1996 working for CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe, I would point out that there is no direct relationship between CAMPFIRE and the ivory trade as implied in the HSUS testimony. CAMPFIRE is a conservation and rural development programme which has resulted in notable benefits for some 2 million rural Zimbabweans and has led to a dramatic increase in elephant numbers. The attached CAMPFIRE Fact Sheet provides some examples of the positive impact of this programme. CAMPFIRE has been endorsed as a leading conservation programme by over 40 renowned US conservation organizations and recently received an overwhelming endorsement from the House of Representatives in the form of a rejection of an amendment aimed at disrupting it.

In relation to the claims that there has been widespread poaching in Africa since the Parties to CITES downlisted the three Southern African populations of elephants. Prior investigations of the alleged incidences used to substantiate this claim has shown that many are based purely on rumor and speculation, with little if any attempt being made in verification, and are, not surprisingly, wrong. For example, the attached letters from the Kenya Wildlife Service concerning the allegations of increased poaching in Kenya state at these allegations are "incorrect and untrue." Similarly, the allegations made concerning increased poaching in Zimbabwe are incorrect. Further, accurate and reliable Research undertaken by WWF and IUCN has illustrated that since 1994 there has been an [crease in elephant poaching throughout Africa. To attribute every case of poaching now occurring to the CITES downlisting ignores the experiences of the last 3 years.

These reports of increased poaching have been compiled by the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) which has established a data base "to monitor any poaching or movement of illegal ivory throughout the world." As the attached EIA letter indicates, the information sources used in the compilation of this data base include "radio, television, print news coverage or even anecdotal" with no efforts being made to verify these. Whether this data collection method is adequate to ensure objective, rigorous scientific evaluation of poaching trends is questionable and may result in more misleading reports. This perpetuation of wild claims and inaccurate rumors about increases in elephant poaching is irresponsible in the extreme and could actually lead to increases in poaching as ivory traders will be led to believe that a market for ivory has reopened.

Parallel to this EIA initiative is the ongoing trade monitoring and reporting process of TRAFFIC international, under the auspices of the IUCN and WWF, particularly through its Bad Ivory Data System (BIDS). TRAFFIC intend to expand and refine this system as the appropriate instrument for measuring the pattern and scale of the illegal trade in ivory. TRAFFIC has established rigorous protocols for data collection and analysis and is approaching this issue with objectivity and impartiality.

Grants made under the auspices of the African Elephant Conservation Act have in the past contributed to some of the most successful elephant conservation initiatives in Africa. These have included those made to CAMPFIRE. Grants made to TRAFFIC have enabled the ivory trade to be monitored in a scientifically rigorous manner. Given the recent downlisting, the impartial scientifically rigorous monitoring of elephant poaching and ivory trade trends and causalities will be essential over the next years if viable elephant management strategies are to be developed further. Further assistance to TRAFFIC will ensure that this is undertaken.

I would urge your continued support for the full range of conservation tools that are currently supported under the African Elephant Conservation Act. Several of these, such as support to CAMPFIRE and TRAFFIC have already proven that they are effective elephant conservation strategies. Only through this process of testing all available options will the optimum conservation strategies ultimately be identified and implemented.

Yours sincerely,

LIZ RIHOY
Director, Washington Office

CAMPFIRE: THE BASICS

The biggest threat facing African wildlife today is the disappearance of its habitat, which is leading to a drastic reduction in wildlife numbers across the continent. The CAMPFIRE program in Zimbabwe addresses this problem by promoting both conservation of wildlife and human development. Its aim is to ensure that wildlife has an economic value for local people thus providing them with an incentive to share the land faith wildlife. The implementation of the CAMPFIRE program is currently supported primarily by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Despite the fact that CAMPFIRE is internationally recognized for its conservation and development achievements, animal rights groups in the United States are aggressively campaigning to prevent further USAID support because trophy hunting is involved in some areas. This campaign ignores the benefits to individual species, wildlife habitat, and approximately 2 million of Zimbabwe's most poverty stricken populace that have occurred since the beginning of the program.

U.S. AID support.—From 1989 to 1994, USAID gave $7.6 million in funding to the program. At that time, four Rural District Councils were involved. USAID has since pledged $20.5 million for the period between 1994–1999, to expand the program to a total of 26 of Zimbabwe's 54 districts. Whilst USAID is the primary donor, Germany, the European Union, Japan, the United Kingdom, Norway and the Netherlands have all provided donor assistance to specific geographical districts, bringing total program expenditure over the 10 years from 1989–99 to approximately $33 million. Drawing upon their experiences with CAMPFIRE, many of these donors are now supporting similar programs in other countries.

Habitat Recovery.—Habitat destruction and degradation have been reversed in many parts of Zimbabwe. In 1980, 12 percent of Zimbabwe was devoted to wildlife management, all within officially designated protected areas. Today, 33 percent of the land is under wildlife management. The entire increase has occurred outside of protected areas. and has substantially contributed to biodiversity conservation.

Wildlife Population Increases.—The elephant population in Zimbabwe has increased from 45,000 in 1980 to 66,000 today and is currently increasing at a rate of 3,000 per year, or 5 percent of the population. Many other species, such as the crocodile and buffalo, are also experiencing similar increases.

People Affected.—In Zimbabwe alone, approximately 2 million people are receiving direct financial benefits from CAMPFIRE, allowing them to move away from their previous position of dependency on aid to a position of self-reliance. The success of the program is now being replicated elsewhere with similar initiatives in Botswana, Namibia, Malawi and Zambia. South Africa, Mozambique, Kenva, Cameroon and Uganda are currently implementing pilot programs along CAMPFIRE principles. These similar initiatives are enabling many millions of people other than the direct beneficiaries of the USAID CAMPFIRE grant to achieve self-reliance.

Support of U.S. Conservation Community.—Mans of the leading conservation agencies in the United States have written strong letters of support to USAID for their continued support of CAMPFIRE. These include, but are not limited to, the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), the National Wildlife Federation (NWF), the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), Biodiversity Action Network;, the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Paul Ehrlich of Stanford University, Safari Club International (SCI) and the Chicago Zoological Society/Brookfield Zoo. Letters have also been received from representatives of the development and biomedical communities.

What the media says.—CAMPFIRE has generated considerable international media interest with positive reports appearing in Newsweek, US News and World Report, the Economist and the Wall Street Journal, to name but a few.

WHAT THE EXPERTS SAY ABOUT CAMPFIRE. ITS SISTER PROGRAMS AND USAID FUNDING

". . . everything I know about the CAMPFIRE program tells me that it is world class. Its strategy for the sustainable harvesting of elephant populations for the benefit of both the elephants and local people has my full support, and that of my colleagues in conservation biology. . . . even the most casual analysis tells one that, in the case of the elephants, the CAMPFIRE programme is on the right side and the HSUS is on the wrong side." Paul Ehrlich, Stanford University.

"By allowing people to derive a direct economic benefit through the sustainable utilization of their own resources, the dependence on foreign aid is broken. . . . CAMPFIRE has helped establish that environmental protection and wildlife conservation can help to improve, and are indeed essential to improving, the quality, of human life. Therefore in the interest of wildlife, the environment, and people, we urge you not only to maintain your support for CAMPFIRE, but to help expand programs like it in the future." Barbara Bramble, National Wildlife Federa-

tion. "The only way to save wildlife and wildlands, especially in poverty-ridden areas, is to provide human beings with incentives to save nature. Most conservationists have come to accept this. Those who oppose it have yet to come up with an alternative that works. We sincerely hope that as CAMPFIRE matures, certain changes will occur. But to cut the AID funding to CAMPFIRE, will only engender more human poverty and suffering as well as enormous losses of African wildlife and habitat." Mike Wright, African Wildlife Foundation.

"By working with people on communal lands to take marginal agricultural and grazing lands and turn them to economically productive use, CAMPFIRE attempts to provide people at the local level a better livelihood. Furthermore, by providing land for wildlife outside of resee es and national parks, CAMPFIRE and its sister programs in other countries produce a real conservation benefit." John Robinson, Wildlife Conservation Society.

"I applaud USAID's support of community based natural resource management programs in Africa, as these programs are vital to conservation of biodiversity. I strongly encourage you to continue to fund these important conservation initiatives." Dr. George Rabb, Chicago Zoological Society.

"Community-based management of natural resources. . . . is proving to be effective in both substantially improving the quality of the lives of the people. . . . and in providing strong incentives for the rural people to conserve the resources I applaud USAID's investment in rural community management of renewable natural resources in Africa and strongly endorse continuation of your funding for these important initiatives." David McDowell, IUCN, The World Conservation Union

"Through the NRM program, USAID has become a world leader in supporting innovative efforts to understand the complex relationship between conservation and development. Conservationists recognize that without incentives for humans to conserve wildlife and their habitats animals and the environment will lose. In the interests of wildlife and the people of Southern Africa, the regional NRM Program deserves continued support." James Leape, World Wildlife Fund.

"CAMPFIRE is an organization that proves that humans and wildlife can coexist and flourish. CAMPFIRE not only reflects the basic tenets of the United States' wildlife policies, but exemplifies the highest goals and successes possible through America's involvement in foreign developments. CAMPFIRE deserves our continued national support, admiration and respect." Robert Easterbrook, Safari Club International.

ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION AGENCY LTD.
London, England, August 1, 1997.

As you will now be aware the elephant downlisting proposals submitted by Namibia, Botswana, and Zimbabwe were adopted at a recent meeting of the tenth Conference of the Parties to CITES in Harare, Zimbabwe. The Environmental Investigation Agency is very concerned that the limited legal trade that will be allowed in 21 months time will give cover to an increased illegal trade and an escalation in poaching will result.

EIA is therefore assembling a database to monitor any poaching or movement of illegal ivory trade throughout the world. To ensure that we have complete up-to-date information and gain an accurate global picture we need to hear from you if there are any incidents of poaching. Illegal trade in ivory or ivory seizures so that we can accurately record the information and build a complete picture of the situation. All sources of information will remain confidential if you so wish.

Information could be from radio, television, print news coverage or even be anecdotal. All information or communication should be directed to me, Steve Trent, or my assistant, Sara Wheeler, at the Environmental Investigation Agency, 15 Bowling Green Lane, London ECIR OBD. Tel: +44–171–490–7040; FAX: +44–171–490–0436.

It would also be useful to have your organisation's full contact details, including address, telephone/fax, and e-mail numbers to ensure that we are able to keep you informed of the situation.

We sincerely hope that we do not see an escalation in the killing of elephants for their ivory and that the guidelines which have been put into place by the CITES secretariat to monitor the trade are adequate. However, if it appears that there is a problem, then through this monitoring system we will be in a position to inform the parties to the Convention of any infringements of the Resolutions.

I look forward to working with you and feel sure that through our combined efforts we will continue to protect elephants throughout the world.

With best wishes,

STEVE TRENT,
Head of Campaigns.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN ZOO AND AQUARIUM ASSOCIATION

Dear Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: The American Zoo and Aquarium Association (AZA) appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments in strong support of S. 627, establishing the Asian Elephant Conservation Act (AsECA), and S. 1287, reauthorizing the African Elephant Conservation Act (AECA) through the year 2002.

The AZA represents virtually every professionally operated zoological park, aquarium, oceanarium, and wild animal park in North America, as well as 6500 individual members. More than 120 million people visit AZA's 182 zoos and aquariums each year, more than attend all professional baseball, basketball, football, and hockey games combined.

The AZA would like to especially thank Senator Jeffords for his strong commitment to these two magnificent species, Chairman Chafee for cosponsoring S. 627, and the committee's commitment to moving this critical legislation to the Senate floor. The AZA is confident the committee will follow the lead of the House of Representatives and approve this legislation quickly and send it to the full Senate for approval.

S. 627—Reauthorization of the African Elephant Conservation Act

In the view of AZA, the African Elephant Conservation Act (AECA) and its subsequent Conservation Fund, is extremely important because it is the only continuous source of money to assist African countries in their conservation efforts to manage this important species. The AECA money has been used to finance over 50 conservation projects in seventeen range states throughout Africa, providing over $5 million in programmatic funding and over $8 million in matching funds. The funds have allowed for enhanced habitat protection—anti-poaching equipment, and the management of these magnificent creatures. The AECA deserves continued strong support from the committee and Congress because it is a good example of an effective public-private partnership. In fact, AZA has urged the Administration to at least double its request of $1 million in both fiscal years 1998 and 1999.

In 1979, the African elephant population stood at 1.3 million—only to see its numbers drop dramatically to approximately 700,000 in 1988 largely due to the worldwide demand for ivory. Today, there are between 250,000–500,000 elephants in seventeen range states throughout Africa. Congress passed the AECA in 1988 to address the growing concerns for the welfare of elephant populations in Africa, and the ivory trade—a direct threat to the survival of many elephant populations. Following the enactment of the law in 1989, the United States imposed a ban on the importation to the United States of African ivory. At that time, the United States consumed 30 percent of all ivory traded in the world. At the height of the ivory trade, approximately 800 toner was being exported from Africa each year, translating to about 80,000 elephant deaths.

By taking the lead to protect the African elephant, both at home and abroad, the United States, (and those nations that followed our lead), have given certain African elephant populations the time—and protection—needed to rebound to sustainable population levels. The AECA has proven itself effective. The Act helps to protect the species from uncontrolled slaughter, conservation efforts that have made a difference.

While the AZA has not been a recipient of AECA funds, our members continue to work with 136 of these magnificent creatures to educate our visitors on the elephant's intelligence, complex social and family structure, and their importance to their ecosystem. Our role and that of our institutions is to educate our visitors. We hope you agree that your role is to guarantee that financial support will be available for other countries and organizations to protect the elephants in the wild for generations to come.

S. 1287—Establishment of the Asian Elephant Conservation Act

In 1988, this committee and its counterpart in the House of Representatives recognized the serious threat the African elephant faced from poaching and loss of habitat by strongly supporting the African Elephant Conservation Act (AECA). While the Act's imposition of a ban on the importation to the United States of Afri-

can ivory was important, the establishment of the Conservation Fund has made the Act critical to the survival of the species.

Regrettably, the Asian elephant is now in need of similar help. It faces serious threats—not just from ivory poaching, but from a greater threat, the loss of habitat due to a rapidly expanding human population throughout its range.

By creating the Asian Elephant Conservation Act (AsECA) and its subsequent Fund, the United States will have the opportunity to once again demonstrate its leadership and commitment to wildlife conservation. The Asian elephant is flagship species for the tropical forests of Asia; securing its long-term viability will in turn assist in the conservation of tigers, rhinoceros, Asiatic wild dog, gaur, green peafowl, kouprey, pheasants, clouded leopards, Malayan sunbears, lion-tailed macaques, and gibbons.

Unlike the African elephant, whose populations range between 250,000 to 500,000 animals, the Asian elephant population only numbers between 35,000 to 45,000 animals. Furthermore, the population is highly fragmented throughout thirteen countries; only in four areas does the population consist of more than 1,000 animals. Its range once stretched widely from Iraq through the Indian subcontinent to China. Today, it can no longer be found in West Asia.

Ironically, for over 4,000 years, this species has enjoyed a unique relationship with humankind in Asia. Elephants serve as an element in certain religious ceremonies, and function in the region's forestry operations. However, because of the serious need to feed the continent's expanding population, people are no longer tolerating incidents of crop-raiding. Resolving the growing friction between humans and elephants will require flexibility and long-term commitment—two tools offered by the Act.

The goals of the Act and its subsequent fund would do the following: (1) protection of the remaining elephant populations and their habitat; (2) establishment and management of specially protected areas; (3) reduction of captures in the wild, most notably in Myanmar (Burma); and (4) promotion of effective community enforcement programs.

S. 1287 would focus on remedies that address human/elephant conflict resolution. That is a difference from the focus of the AECA which focuses on trade-related aspects of conservation. The Act would give support to projects that accomplish one or more of the following: (1) directly promote wild elephant management practices; (2) monitor population trends; (3) assess annual ranging patterns of known populations; (4) enforce CITES; (5) encourage law enforcement through community participation; (6) translocate elephants; and (7) conduct community outreach and education.

Today, AZA institutions exhibit 155 Asian elephants. Asian and African elephants are magnificent animals that are difficult to exhibit, manage, and breed. They have complex social structures—at times rivaling those of humankind—and are extremely intelligent.

As important as it is for our institutions to conduct research on and educate our visitors about the life patterns of the Asian elephant, it is as equally important that resources be made available to protect the wild Asian elephant populations in its habitat.

In summary, AZA strongly believes S. 1287 should receive the full support of the committee for the following reasons:

- It will provide competitive financing where it is needed most -in the wild to support protection, conservation, and management of threatened Asian elephants;
- It is focused and cost-effective, yet flexible enough to address immediate needs for conservation;
- It will encourage donations from private resources—a fine example of a public-private partnership; and
- Funding requests will be based on sound science.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

○